



UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS LIBRARY
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN
CLASSICS

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

To renew call Telephone Center, 333-8400

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

JUL 10 1986

OCT 17 2005

JAN 17 2017



080
86
V. 9:1

Classics

2000

ILLINOIS CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME IX.1
SPRING 1984



J. K. Newman, *Editor*

ISSN 0363-1923

ILLINOIS CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME IX.1

Spring 1984

J. K. Newman, *Editor*

*Patet omnibus veritas; nondum est occupata;
multum ex illa etiam futuris relictum est.
Sen. Epp. 33. 11*

SCHOLARS PRESS

ISSN 0363-1923

THE LIBRARY OF THE
SEP 5 - 1984
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

ILLINOIS CLASSICAL STUDIES
VOLUME IX.1

©1984
Scholars Press
101 Salem Street
P.O. Box 2268
Chico, California 95927

Printed in the U.S.A.

880
Ill
v. 7

ADVISORY EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

John J. Bateman
Harold C. Gotoff

Howard Jacobson
David Sansone

Responsible Editor: J. K. Newman

The Editor welcomes contributions, which should not normally exceed twenty double-spaced typed pages, on any topic relevant to the elucidation of classical antiquity, its transmission or influence. Consistent with the maintenance of scholarly rigor, contributions are especially appropriate which deal with major questions of interpretation, or which are likely to interest a wider academic audience. Care should be taken in presentation to avoid technical jargon, and the trans-rational use of acronyms. *Homines cum hominibus loquimur.*

Contributions should be addressed to:

The Editor,
Illinois Classical Studies,
Department of the Classics,
4072 Foreign Languages Building,
707 South Mathews Avenue,
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Each contributor receives twenty-five offprints.

Preface

The Editor and Editorial Committee would like to thank the Executive Committee of the School of Humanities, and its Director, Dr. Nina Baym, for a subvention towards the costs of publication of the current volume.

Mrs. Mary Ellen Fryer kindly helped with the putting on line of typescripts. Mr. Carl Kibler of the Printing Services Office oversaw the transition to the PENTA system.

Once again, Frances Stickney Newman's dedicated labors made the whole thing possible.

J. K. Newman

Contents

1.	Towards a Practical Criticism of Caesar's Prose Style	1
	H. C. GOTOFF, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign	
2.	The New Gallus and the Origins of Latin Love Elegy	19
	J. K. NEWMAN, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign	
3.	Propertius Book IV: Themes and Structures	30
	J. P. SULLIVAN, University of California, Santa Barbara	
4.	Some Elucidations of Petronius' <i>Cena Trimalchionis</i>	35
	PETER HOWELL, Bedford College, London	
5.	The Addressee of <i>Laus Pisonis</i>	42
	M. D. REEVE, University of Toronto	
6.	Pietatis Ergo	49
	A LETTER FROM A. S. PEASE TO CYRIL BAILEY	
7.	Notes on Pseudo-Quintilian's Minor Declamations	53
	W. S. WATT, Aberdeen, Scotland	
8.	Theory and Practice in the Vergilian Cento	79
	DAVID F. BRIGHT, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign	
9.	Zu Claudians Invektive gegen Rufin	91
	HERMANN FUNKE, Universität Mannheim	
10.	Byzantina Varia	110
	GERALD M. BROWNE, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign	
11.	<i>Alcestis Barcinonensis</i>	111
	MIROSLAV MARCOVICH, University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign	



1

Towards a Practical Criticism of Caesar's Prose Style

H. C. GOTOFF

W. Jackson Bate in his biography of Samuel Johnson observes:¹

Yet such is the control of semantics over the mind that when words (above all abstract labels) are learned early in life, the associations acquired with them at that time seem almost permanently "imprinted," except for a small number of people who in each generation try to enlarge or correct them.

So it is with labels applied to literary figures and their styles. So it is with Caesar.

The received opinion regarding the style of Caesar is uncomplicated and broadly apprehended. It goes back to Cicero:

[commentarios] . . . nudi enim sunt, recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta. sed dum voluit alios habere parata, unde sumerent qui vellent scribere historiam, ineptis gratum fortasse fecit, qui illa volent calamistris inurere: sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit; nihil est enim in historia pura et inlustri brevitae dulcius. (Cic. *Brutus* 262)

Caesar is said to have written a pure Latin, simple and direct. He exercised a strict economy in the use of a vocabulary limited to the plain diction of educated Romans. As a plain stylist, he avoided obtrusive ornamentation which, if used in excess, might smack of Asianism. He had studied, after all, with the same Molon of Rhodes

¹ W. Jackson Bate, *Samuel Johnson* (Cambridge 1977), p. 191.—The Latin is quoted throughout from O. Seel's Teubner edition of the *B.G.* (Stuttgart 1961).

whom Cicero credits with having chastened his own style.² Both in his Commentaries and in his oratory — which is described as forceful, vivid, and direct³ — the virtues of Caesar's style are achieved through the self-effacing ornament of *sermonis elegantia*, that is, the perfect choice of the right word and expression.⁴ The sources of this judgment, Cicero and Hirtius,⁵ seem unimpeachable; from them derives the almost universally held view that the Commentaries of Caesar are the straightforwardly lucid and objectively-told accounts of the *res gestae* of their author.

In the past century, however, a certain amount of discussion has been devoted to various questions that ultimately relate to composition and style. Historians, especially, have raised the reasonable suspicion that behind the specious objectivity and straightforwardness of the Commentaries lies calculated — and extremely successful — propaganda of self-aggrandisement.⁶ The most extreme statement of this view is that propounded by M. Rambaud, who finds almost limitless distortion of fact and sequence for the purpose of covering up military errors and loss.⁷ Other scholars have pointed out that the corollary of this view is difficult to draw: that there was an audience which both needed convincing of Caesar's portrayal of his *res gestae* and yet was not politically incapable of being convinced.⁸

² Plutarch, *Caesar* 3; Cicero, *Brutus* 316.

³ Cicero, *Brutus* 251-53; Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* X. 1, 114. In a letter to Caecilius Nepos, cited in Suetonius, *Iul.* 55, Cicero says of Caesar's oratory: *quis sententiis aut acutior aut crebrior? quis verbis aut ornatiores aut elegantiores?* This is a reminder that *elegantia* of the plain style does not preclude *ornatus* (cf. *Brutus* 197 of Scaevola: *tum ita breviter et presse et satis ornate et pereleganter diceret . . .*); *neglegentia diligens* is the virtue of the plain stylist at *Orat.* 78, after which he says specifically *unum aberit . . . ornatum illud*. *Ornatus* is generally associated with *copia*, another virtue generally denied the *genus humile*. But in this case, too, Cicero is not entirely consistent; and, in any case, when Cicero praises Caesar, he may be grovelling.

⁴ Cicero, *Brutus* 253: *verborum delectum originem esse eloquentiae*.

⁵ Hirtius, *Bellum Gallicum VIII*, praef. 4-7.

⁶ For the overview, see H. Oppermann's "Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge" to Kraner, Dittenberger, Meusel, *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii De Bello Gallico* (Berlin 1975), pp. 469-77. It is interesting that before Rambaud stated his most extreme position (see below, note 7 and text), J. H. Collins, *Propaganda, Ethics, and Psychological Assumptions in Caesar's Writing* (diss. Frankfurt 1952), pp. 3-18, and C. E. Stevens, "The Bellum Gallicum as a Work of Propaganda," *Latomus* XI (1952), pp. 165-79, had already treated the question.

⁷ M. Rambaud, *La Déformation Historique chez César* (2nd ed., Paris 1966).

⁸ See most recently R. M. Ogilvie, *Roman Literature and Society* (Harmondsworth 1980), p. 65. The review of Rambaud by J. H. Collins in *Gnomon* XXVI (1954), pp. 527-33 is equally skeptical; by contrast, R. Bruère in his review (*Classical Philology* L [1955], pp. 142-46) shows himself more convinced.

Somewhat more recently other scholars have addressed the question of the genre of the Commentaries, their literary antecedents, and their relationship both to the "dispassionate," annalistic tradition (represented by Claudius Quadrigarius and Calpurnius Piso), on the one hand, and the more dramatically oriented historical style of Livy, on the other.⁹ One problem that confounds this investigation is that, though commentaries appear to have been produced by generals before Caesar, e.g., by Sulla, nothing of them exists for comparison.¹⁰ The assumption that a literary artist of the stature of Caesar would not have produced a work significantly different in style and form from less talented predecessors is weak on its face, yet necessary for a comparative study. Further, the fragments of the annalists, unless we reject one of the passages Gellius claims to preserve, do not unanimously support the assessment of a plain, dispassionate, unadorned style.¹¹

A more basic consideration than either of the above and, indeed, a prerequisite for both is a detailed and comprehensive study of the style of the Commentaries. Since the late nineteenth century, when it was discovered that in the Seventh Book of *De Bello Gallico* Caesar deviates palpably from some of the features that had previously been distinctive of his style, a development in his manner of writing has been taken for granted by those few scholars who have written on the Commentaries as literature.¹²

This observation has been used to support various arguments:

⁹ P. T. Eden, "Caesar's Style: Inheritance versus Intelligence," *Glotta* 40 (1962), pp. 74-117. Before Eden, the most extensive study was that of F. R. Boemer, "Der Commentarius. Zur Vorgeschichte und literarischen Form," *Hermes* 81 (1953), pp. 210-50. The subject had been opened by A. Klotz, *Caesarstudien* (Leipzig und Berlin 1910), ch. 1.

¹⁰ See Boemer, *op. cit.*, pp. 226-36.

¹¹ Gellius, *N.A.* IX. 11. 3-9 (cf. H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* [Leipzig 1870] I, pp. 205-37). The attribution is rejected by J. Marouzeau, "Pour mieux Comprendre les Textes Latins," *Rev. de Philol.* 45 (1921), pp. 149-93; M. von Albrecht (below, note 14), p. 118, among others. The most powerful argument seems to be the principle of "one man, one style."

¹² G. Ihm, "Die stilistische Eigenart des VII Buches von Caesars Bellum Gallicum," *Philologus* Suppl. VI (1882-83), pp. 767 ff. Cf. Ihm, "Das VII Buch des Bellum Gallicum," *Berl. Philol. W.* (1886), pp. 1010-12; (1889), pp. 355-56. Two extensive studies of changes in Caesar's style have appeared in the last twenty years: D. Rasmussen, *Caesars Commentarii. Stil und Stilwandel am Beispiel der direkten Rede* (Göttingen 1963), for which see also the review by E. Mensching in *Helikon* 7 (1967), pp. 487-92; and F.-H. Mutschler, *Erzählstil und Propaganda in Caesars Kommentarien* (Heidelberg 1975), in which the categories selected to indicate development would have better responded to practical than statistical analysis.

The precision in the use of words, the *pura et illustris brevitās* which Cicero praises in Caesar's writings is a constant phenomenon. But as the commentaries proceed, they exhibit some differences of style. It has often been observed how the First Book of the *Gallic Wars* is more formal in a *commentarius* manner than the second, and after that the style becomes slightly more informal in the next four books. The Seventh Book has more movement still and, as it were, flows faster, and the same is true of the *Civil War*. The constructions and the run of the sentences become freer, and there are changes of a kind which suggests a change in habit rather than a reasoned change of preference in the search for the right word.¹³

Whether Sir Frank Adcock would further have elucidated these judgments had they not been offered primarily as an indication that Caesar did not write the *Gallic Wars* all at once, we cannot tell. As the criticism stands, it makes sense, I think, only to the converted. It is true to say that most investigations of Caesar's style are limited to vocabulary and verb position.¹⁴ That Adcock is satisfied to consider the first book, replete as it is with highly rhetorical, albeit indirect, speeches is an indication of the lack of specificity and definition in Caesarian criticism.¹⁵

P. T. Eden pointed to particular features which he labeled as distinguishing an older, "annalistic" tradition, such as *oratio obliqua*, artless repetition of phrases, excessive use of weak demonstratives—the need for which is obviated by the "comprehensive Livian period" (Eden's phrase)—and nearly uniform word-order and sentence structure.¹⁶ His point is that Caesar progressively, beginning with the last book of the *De Bello Gallico*, moved away from these features. Yet when, in the realm of composition he stresses a growing variety in the placement by Caesar of the verb, he continues to visualize an essentially simple sentence. That "comprehensive Livian period" is apparently considered to be beyond Caesar even in his developed, later style.

Eden's formula for the typical sentence in annalistic prose and in

¹³ Sir Frank Adcock, *Caesar as a Man of Letters* (Cambridge 1956), pp. 64-65.

¹⁴ The major exception is Michael von Albrecht's *Meister römischer Prosa von Cato bis Apuleius* (Heidelberg 1975), pp. 75-89. He deals with some of the same features studied in this paper. But, since he takes his examples from Book VII, he does not counter the common view of late stylistic development.

¹⁵ A practical analysis of the speeches that dominate Book I will show the carefully controlled rhetorical ornamentation and delicate *ethopoiia* that makes Book I perhaps the least typical part of the Caesarian corpus. Eden makes a start, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-08.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 79-80.

the great bulk of Caesar's corpus is: subject first or early, verb last.¹⁷ This coincides with the universally accepted notion of the typical Caesarian sentence, as articulated in histories of literature. Caesar, it is thought, wrote essentially simple sentences, perhaps achieving some temporal or causal subordination by use of a discrete ablative absolute. He ended his sentences with the verb. Adjectives and genitives would be expected adjacent to their governing nouns, and object phrases precede the prepositional phrases and other adverbial elements that adhere more closely to the verb. Such sentences do abound throughout the corpus of Caesar, but they are far from exhausting his sentence typologies.

There is a good deal of complexity and much intricacy of composition to be observed in the text of the *De Bello Gallico*, well in advance of the seventh book, where Eden makes the break and Adcock acknowledges a marked acceleration. What is needed for the study of style—and almost never afforded it—is close analysis of the text itself. I propose in what follows to touch upon three aspects of Caesar's style of which the readers of literary history would be little aware and which, illustrating my quotation from Bate, many readers of Caesar, guided by the *opinio recepta*, neither look for nor notice.

What does not follow, and eventually will in a more substantial exposition, is a full discussion of the relationship between the author's style and his motives. Obviously the Commentaries are a form of self-advertisement; what form of self-advertisement is less obvious. The fact that the style becomes more dramatic with the *De Bello Gallico*, rather than altering at the beginning of the *De Bello Civili*, might detract from the argument that Caesar wanted to present himself differently as conqueror of Gaul and as participant in the Civil War. Rambaud's book argues that Caesar was a consummate artist, employing devices of composition to obfuscate, alter, deceive, and aggrandize himself as a military genius by distorting facts. While it is important to observe and analyze the attitudes towards presentation of material in Caesar—Caesar's figures of thought—the artist's motives may have been quite different and less defensive than Rambaud suggests.

Rambaud's insistence on observing the text is, in any case, all to the good and has given rise to other works that approach the

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-94, though he later acknowledges greater structural variety in Caesar, pp. 110-11.

Commentaries as a persuasive, self-consciously artistic genre.¹⁸ Even a plain stylist—as Caesar is usually characterized—composes with an end in view. Indeed, as Cicero indicates, the plain style is the most difficult to sustain.¹⁹ It may be that Caesar has succeeded all too well in disguising his art; that centuries of readers, praising him, predictably, for precisely those virtues Cicero assigned to him, have failed to notice his diversity, his deceptiveness, and his power. In saying this, I have anticipated my purpose. The first step is to find, through detailed analysis, components of Caesarian composition.

One of the first things one notices in a style of composition universally characterized as plain is the unusual position of words. It is expected that, in the absence of striving for special effects, adjectives and dependent genitives will accompany their nouns. That the ancients noticed deviations from that expectation is proved by the existence of the figure of speech called *hyperbaton*.²⁰ Merely to say that Caesar employed *hyperbaton*, however, would not be sufficient to suspect him of a style more ornate than plain. Figures of speech are no more valuable as comprehensive labels to describe style than broader critical terminology. The artist's use of the figure needs to be examined. *Hyperbaton* is found in all authors, even the earliest Latin prose authors, and in their most prosaic texts.²¹ Variations from normal usage, or usage for obvious effect, become part of the author's self-conscious artistry. Even in so familiar and apparently unremarkable a usage as the insertion of a postpositive between the *praenomen* and *nomen* of a Roman name, Cicero's practice varied. It has been discovered that, while Cicero uses such formulations in speeches to the Senate and *ad iudices*, they are unexampled in the popular speeches.²²

¹⁸ E.g. W. Richter, *Caesar als Darsteller seiner Taten* (Heidelberg 1977), esp. pp. 141-51; G. Pascucci, "Interpretazione linguistica e stilistica del Cesare autentico," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* I. 3 (Berlin 1973), pp. 488-522. This is not to imply that good work on style had to wait for Rambaudo; see T. Feller, *Caesars Kommentieren über den Gallischen Krieg und die kunstmässige Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig 1929).

¹⁹ See Cicero's discussion at *Orator* 75-91, but for the polemical slant, see also below, note 42.

²⁰ See H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1973), pp. 357-59. The best study of the figure is by A. W. Ahlberg: "De traiectionis figura ab antiquissimis prosae scriptoribus latinis adhibita," *Eranos* XI (1911), pp. 88-106.

²¹ See Ahlberg, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

²² I owe this to Mr. George Panayiotou, whose forthcoming dissertation on the stylistic variations in Ciceronian speeches addressed to different classes of audience is a storehouse of independently discovered, exhaustively documented features of Cicero's style.

In the following examples the separation of the adjective from the noun creates the expectation of the noun, emphasizes the adjective, and brackets the phrase:

summi ut sint laboris . . . (B.G. IV.2)

—of German oxen; the double displacement makes the phrase striking. If we could be sure that Caesar was merely trying to avoid alliteration, we would have a valuable piece of stylistic knowledge.

qua minime arduus ad nostras munitiones ascensus videbatur . . . (B.G. II. 33)

Here, as elsewhere in Caesar and other prose authors, the bracketing of "adjective . . . noun" allows for the inclusion of adverbial material not otherwise expected to modify a noun.

So, too,

brevissimus in Britanniam traiectus. (B.G. IV. 21)

In both these examples the verbal noun tolerates adverbial material, so that the effect of the phrasing is to gain compactness. Similarly,

sibi nullam cum iis amicitiam esse posse . . . (B.G. IV.8)

where **nullam amicitiam cum iis sibi esse posse* would mean something rather different.

The delay through separation of a partitive genitive from a governing neuter pronoun may be a feature of unself-conscious Latin, found as early as in the Elder Cato's *De Agricultura*.²³ Yet, in:

quantum iam apud eos hostes uno proelio auctoritatis essent consecuti sentiebat. (B.G. IV. 13)

the length of the separation is less striking than the advantage Caesar takes of the separation to stress the inserted *uno proelio*.

I have not noticed the same propensity to separate adjectives (even indefinites) from their governing nouns as partitives from their governing words in early Latin, yet the next example may be in articulation not very different from the last:

ne quam noctu oppidani a militibus iniuriam acciperent. (B.G. II. 33)

To understand the word-order, though, it is necessary to quote the initial main clause:

sub vesperum Caesar portas claudi militesque ex oppido exire iussit,

²³ See Ahlberg, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

It is normal for *ne quam* to appear together: *noctu*, following from *sub vesperum*, comes next, and Caesar inserts a *militibus* into the object phrase to create the collocation of *oppidani* and a *militibus*. Those critics who praise Caesar's minimal vocabulary may well point to a sentence like this one for repeated words and lexical stems. Much more is at work here, as Caesar details his attention to details.

The articulation:

quam quisque ab opere in partem casu devenit . . . (B.G. II. 21)

occasioned, partly perhaps, by the desire to separate *ab opere* from *casu* and to create an, albeit zeugmatic, anaphoric parallelism of *quam* . . . *quaque* . . . *ad haec*, is also best considered in the development of the whole section.²⁴ It is the third reference to the *partes* of the Roman position.

Caesar . . . ad cohortandos milites, quam in partem fors obtulit, decurrit et ad legionem decimam devenit. [An exhortation in *oratio obliqua* follows.] atque in alteram partem item cohortandi causa profectus pugnantis occurrit. [A dramatic statement of the paucity of time for organization follows.] quam quisque ab opere in partem casu devenit quaque prima signa conspexit, ad haec constitit . . .

The collocation of *ab opere* and *in partem* reinforces the sense of *casu* and the randomness of the formation. Exigencies of time and the enthusiasm of the enemy make any further attempt at organization impossible.

Although the battle with the Nervii is frequently accorded special attention and praise for the artistry of Caesar's dramatic presentation, critics claiming the slow development of the author's style do not come to terms with a substantial section of highly ornamental and contrived prose coming so early in the corpus (B.G. II. 16-27).²⁵ The propensity to find only what one expects to find in the style of Caesar has occasioned the excision of the highly formal tricolon with which the passage ends.²⁶ A locution like the following is left undiscussed, probably because its peculiarity is unnoticed:

temporis tanta fuit exiguitas hostiumque tam paratus ad dimicandum animus . . . (B.G. II. 21)

²⁴ I have noticed that the anticipation of the antecedent by the relative clause is found in Caesar only in highly rhetorical passages, almost exclusively in speeches in *oratio obliqua*.

²⁵ E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* (repr. Darmstadt 1958), p. 219, singles out B.G. II. 27 for special praise, without mentioning the uniqueness of the composition.

²⁶ By Gruppe, followed by Meusel and Fuchs; see Seel's app. crit. *ad loc.*

Temporis, as Rambaud points out,²⁷ is the effective word and deserves its place at the beginning of the sentence in asyndeton. But that does not explain the *hyperbaton* (cf. *temporis exiguitas postulabat* at *B.G.* II. 33), still less the more extreme parallel *hyperbaton* of *hostium . . . animus*. In each case the genitive raises the expectation of the governing noun, in which the drama lies. The parallelism is artificial and artistic.

Hyperbaton figures in the Caesarian ablative absolute. For the Tullio-centric student of Latin, the ablative absolute is a compendious construction composed of a participle and noun, perhaps with a brief modifier inserted. Such short phrases are to be found in Caesar as well, but Caesar will also use the ablative absolute to govern more extensive phrases like gerundives or even dependent clauses. They represent a very different attitude towards the construction between those authors, one in which Livy is more closely allied with Caesar than Cicero. Although in both Cicero and Caesar the ablative absolute introduces and disposes of material (generally) in anticipation of the main predicate, Cicero appears to have found complex structures within the ablative absolute too weighted and compact. He prefers to dispose of subordinate material more evenly over the structure of the main predicate. Not so with Caesar.

saepibusque densissimis, ut ante demonstravimus, interiectis . . . (*B.G.* II. 22)

iis impedimentis, quae secum agere ac portare non poterant, citra flumen Rhenum depositis . . . (*B.G.* II. 29)

Sometimes the dependent element is too complicated or long for inclusion within the ablative absolute complex:

celeriter ut ante Caesar imperaverat ignibus significatione facta . . . (*B.G.* II. 33)

cuius adventu spe inlata militibus ac redintegrato animo, cum pro se quisque in conspectu imperatoris etiam extremis suis rebus operam navare cuperet . . . (*B.G.* II. 25)

The whole psychological motivation for the predicate of the sentence is given in a highly involved locution before the brief, but emphatic main clause expressed, significantly, in the passive:

. . . paulum hostium impetus tardatus est.

The kind of imbalance between the ablative absolute phrase and the

²⁷ M. Rambaud, *De Bello Gallico Secundus Tertiusque Libri* (Paris 1965), *ad loc.*

main clause is not limited, for the early books, to the battle with the Nervii:

eorum satisfactione accepta et itinere exquisito per Diviciacum, quod e Gallis ei maximam fidem habebat, ut milium amplius quinquaginta circuitu locis apertis exercitum duceret, de quarta vigilia, ut dixerat, profectus est. (B.G. I. 41)

Caesar has just finished a long passage describing how he brought under control a wave of irrational panic in the Roman camp. Having dealt successfully with that problem, he is ready to move. The detail of the reconnoitered marching plan appears too important to leave out (Caesar leaves nothing to chance), but he does not want it to slow up the narrative (in the predicate) unduly.

He uses a similar structure to describe the deceit of the Atuatuca. Here, three ablative absolute constructions mark the progress of the action, leading up to a brief statement of fact.

armorum magna multitudine de muro in fossam
 quae erat ante oppidum
 iacta,
 sicut prope summam muri aggerisque altitudinem acervi armorum
 adaequarent,
 et tamen circiter parte tertia,
 ut postea perspectum est,
 celata atque in oppido retenta,
 portis patefactis
 eo die pace sunt usi. (B.G. II.32)

The first two structures are explicitly balanced in antithesis (*et tamen*) before the compendious *portis patefactis* following the execution of the plan. The main clause, conspicuously terse, is sardonic.

From the above examples it is clear that Caesar did not limit himself to the simple sentence, verb last, with which he is associated. He often includes a substantial amount of subordinate material within the compass of a single syntactic unit. To this extent, he is, by definition, periodic in his composition. With the need, perhaps, for a more basic adherence to narrative sequence, Caesar does not generally achieve a smooth distribution of clauses and phrases over the sentence in the Ciceronian manner;²⁸ though such sentences can be found:

{ipse (equo vulnerato) deiectus} {(quoad potuit) fortissime restitit.}
 (B.G. IV. 12)

²⁸ See H. C. Gotoff, *Cicero's Elegant Style* (Urbana 1979), p. 67 and *passim*.

The function served by the participle in the ablative absolute of governing further subordinate elements is shared by other participial phrases in substantial, i.e., subordinating phrases. Again, by making participial phrases major structures for controlling dependent syntactic material, Caesar generally ends up with a predicate construction that is shorter than Cicero's and with less distribution of weighted clausal material over the predicate. Caesar's use of the participial phrase to carry a variety of subordinate constructions again allies him more closely with Livy.

In Cicero the participle sometimes governs a complementary clause; in Caesar, it may govern any subordinate element, complementary, adjectival, or adverbial.²⁹

quos sibi Caesar oblatos gavisus . . . (B.G. IV.13)

is a construction that might occur in Cicero.

pollicitus hortatusque, ut in ea sententia permanerent . . . (B.G. IV.21)

is less likely. The following exemplify a technique for subordinating elements in a sentence that is favored by Caesar, but foreign to Cicero.

Caesar questus quod, cum ultro in continentem legatis missis pacem ab se petissent, bellum sine causa intulissent, ignoscere imprudentiae dixit . . . (B.G. IV. 27)

The *quod*-clause is complementary to (and, in a sense, explanatory of) *questus*; it governs an adverbial clause. Caesar gives full value to the deceit before subordinating the whole circumstance to his response. *Imprudentiae* echoes an earlier *propter imprudentiam ut ignosceretur petiverunt*. The articulation makes clear what Caesar thought of their excuse of *imprudentia*.

Caesar etsi . . . fore videbat, ut . . . periculum effugerent, tamen nactus equites circiter xxx, quos Commius Atrebas, de quo ante dictum est, secum transportaverat, legiones in acie pro castris constituit. (B.G. IV. 35)

quos [hostes] tanto spatio secuti, quantum cursu et viribus efficere potuerunt, complures ex iis occiderunt.³⁰ (B.G. IV. 35)

²⁹ See Eric Laughton, *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford 1964), pp. 29-30.

³⁰ On *ex iis*, see, first P. Hellwig, *Über den Pleonasmus bei Caesar* (diss. Berlin 1889), esp. p. 7. This feature, not to be confused with the device mentioned above, note 24, is universally noticed. Von Albrecht, *op. cit.*, p. 83 suggests attractively, but not, perhaps, convincingly, that it is a conscious element of a functional style.

In the first and third examples, the participial phrase begins the period and structures all the material, leaving a brief and emphatic main clause. That this procedure is not invariable can be seen in the middle sentence, in which the period is composed of an adversative condition before the main clause which is introduced by the participial phrase. Within the main clause, then, all the subordinate material is subsumed under *nactus*—a relative clause modifying the subject of another relative clause—before the simple statement of Caesar's action.

Frequently, the material—even of extensive participial phrases—is arranged with no special attention to effect beyond logical sequence. At other times, the structure can become quite imposing:

hoc sibi Caesar satis opportune accidisse arbitratus,

quod neque post tergum hostem relinquere volebat

neque belli gerendi propter anni tempus facultatem habebat

neque has tantularum rerum occupationes Britanniae anteponendas iudicabat,

magnum iis numerum obsidum imperat. (*B.G.* IV. 22)

Each reason is given full weight in the *quod*-clause; the anaphora of *neque* is felt as is the *hyperbaton* of *belli gerendi facultatem*. This orderly syntactic composition represents the progression of thought that led Caesar to his decision to accept the representations of the Morini.³¹

In spite of the obvious differences between his composition and that of Cicero, it is clear that the so-called plain stylist of the Commentaries shares some essential literary techniques with the orator and essayist. The above sentence, like so many complex sentences in Caesar, is perfectly periodic. The main concession that must be made, to this point, is that the participial phrase in Caesar should be acknowledged as a major subordinating element. A rather dramatic example of this usage follows, in which the participle *parati* governs a preceding *ut*-clause, which in turn governs a preceding conditional clause.

³¹ It is instructive to cite the translation of J. Warrington who treats the implications of a (logically) non-parallel relationship of the propositions in the *quod*-clauses: "for although I had no wish to leave an enemy hanging at my back, the season was too advanced to start another campaign; and, in any case, the British campaign was clearly more important than the conquest of these petty states," *Caesar's War Commentaries* (London 1965), p. 65.

nostri autem, si ab illis initium transeundi fieret, ut impeditos adgred-
erentur, parati in armis erant.³² (B.G. II. 9)

Weighted participial phrases playing against a brief emphatic main clause is just one kind of complex Caesarian sentence. He is capable of setting out formally balanced periods.

ita uno tempore

et longas naves,

quibus Caesar exercitum transportandum curaverat

quasque in aridum subduxerat,

aestus complebat,

et onerarias

quae ad ancoras erant deligatae,

tempestas adflictabat.

neque ulla nostris facultas aut administrandi

aut auxiliandi dabatur. (B.G. IV. 29)

The anticipatory *et* begins the almost symmetrical structure *et longas naves* + relative + governing verb // *onerarias* (sc. *naves*) + relative clause + verb, forcing the reader to *adflictabat*. The relationship of the next clause to this carefully constructed parallel unit introduces a complex question of Caesar's rhetoric. The very break after the parallelism suggests a separation, though the description of the effects of the storm on the fleet provides the reason (and excuse) for Caesar's inability to act. It is the syntactic independence of the last clause that stresses the reason, while giving the excuse.

Allobrogibus se

vel persuasuros

quod nondum bono animo in p.R. viderentur

existimabant

vel vi coacturos

ut per suos fines eos ire paterentur. (B.G. I.6)

The parallel future infinitives are in syntactic balance unexceptional for cases in which others or Caesar himself treats balanced alternatives. The anticipatory *vel* sets up and insists upon the balance in a way not unusual for Caesar.³³ The placement of the main verb, however,

³² *Parati* is participial; *parati in armis erant* corresponds antithetically with the intransitive predicate of the previous sentence: *hanc si nostri transirent, hostes expectabant*.

³³ See K. Lorenz, *Über Anaphora und Chiasmus in Caesars Bellum Gallicum* (diss. Creuzburg 1875), pp. 2-4. The fact that he does not add examples of *vel . . . vel* to those of *aut* and *sive* is not material.

between the clauses, with periodicity guaranteed beyond the verb by anticipatory *vel*, marks a kind of stylistic decision not generally associated with Caesar. In view of the opinion that Caesar's style developed and became more embellished towards the end of *De Bello Gallico*, it is significant that this example occurs early in the first book.

The style of any prose writer's composition is first determined by his decision as to how much subordinate material to include within a period. Next, the distribution of that material becomes the issue. Caesar is capable of a large amount of variety in both areas. As the examples are collected and analyzed, then considered in terms of their context, Caesar's stylistic choices will take on more meaning.

reliquum exercitum Q. Titurio Sabino et L. Aurunculeio Cottae legatis
in Menapios atque in eos pagos Morinorum,
a quibus ad eum legati non venerant,
ducendum dedit;

P. Sulpicium Rufum legatum cum eo praesidio
quod satis esse arbitrabatur,
portum tenere iussit. (B.G. IV. 22)

This has overtones of what has been suggested to be an official style for military reports: object first, verb last, asyndeton.³⁴ Certainly, whether reporting his actions to the Senate or to his readers, such sentences seem straightforward and uncomplicated. On the other hand, there are elements of similarity and deliberate variation that can hardly be casual. The early mention of the people to whom the authority is delegated (*legatis* // *legatum*), the relative clauses, and especially the anticipation of each relative by a demonstrative adjective modifying the antecedent, all speak for careful attention to parallelism. On the other hand, Caesar chooses two different constructions to express his commands (*exercitum ducendum dedit* // *portum tenere iussit*), resulting in the legates appearing in different cases.

These lines come at the end of a passage in which Caesar has been describing his extensive preparations for his first British expedition and provide, in their suggestion of repeated sentence rhythm, a conclusion to those controlled and well thought-out preparations. The next sentence begins with the words: *his constitutis rebus*.

Not only does a practical criticism of Caesar's composition dem-

³⁴ See H. Fränkel, "Über philologische Interpretation am Beispiel von Caesars gallischen Krieg," *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* 9 (1933), pp. 26-41 = *Wege und Formen Frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1955), pp. 294-312; and E. Fraenkel, "Eine Form Römischer Kriegsbuletin," *Eranos* LIV (1956), pp. 189-94 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome 1964), pp. 69-73.

onstrate a variety of sentence typologies, but it makes clear that Caesar composed beyond the limit of a single sentence, no matter how complex. How this texturing through kinds of composition is brought into play in extended passages remains to be investigated in detail. It is patently an issue in one of the most frequently cited passages in the *De Bello Gallico*, II. 27.³⁵ The encomium to those who fought on both sides in the battle of the Scambre is so obviously ornamental that the final balance has been suspected and even rejected by some editors.³⁶ This is indicative of the attitude that has been taken towards the artistry of Caesar. What offends the preconception is treated with suspicion and by some removed.³⁷ Scholars who cannot convince themselves to take this extreme position countenance such passages without ever stating that the question of Caesar's style is more complex than the *communis opinio* suggests.

The battle with the Nervii is a dramatic set piece in the *De Bello Gallico*, marking far earlier than usually acknowledged a departure from the so-called *commentarius* style. The entire passage deserves the detailed analysis of practical criticism.³⁸ What follows is the summation, after the Romans, buoyed by the arrival of Caesar and Labienus, have turned the tide of battle:

horum adventu tanta rerum commutatio est facta,

ut nostri, etiam qui vulneribus confecti procubuissent,

scutis innixi proelium redintegrarent,

calones perterritos hostes conspicati etiam inermes armatis occurrerent,

equites vero, ut turpitudinem fugae virtute delerent,

³⁵ See above, note 25, and the more detailed studies by H. P. Kohns-Andernach, "Der Verlauf der Nervierschlacht," *Gymnasium* 76 (1969), pp. 1-17 and G. Pascucci, "I Mezzi Espressivi e Stilistici di Cesare nel Processo di Deformazione Storica dei Commentari," *Stud. Class. e Orientali* 6 (1956), pp. 137-74. Both proceed from the discussion of the passage in H. Oppermann, *Caesar, der Schriftsteller und sein Werk* (Leipzig 1933), esp. pp. 55-64, but he treats the passage *passim*. C. Neumeister, *Grundsätze der Forensischen Rhetorik* (Munich 1964), pp. 168-69, in comparing Cicero and Caesar, sets out II. 25 in linear form to demonstrate phraseology. But he omits certain phrases and draws no specific conclusions as to Caesar's composition.

³⁶ See above, note 26. O. Seel, *C. Iulius Caesar I, Bellum Gallicum* (Stuttgart 1961), *app. crit. ad loc.*: "stylus utcumque durus," but the full note is very much to the point.

³⁷ *Quamvis* at B.G. IV. 2 has exercised scholars because its use there is unique. The equally unique and more surprising *aequo Marte* at VII. 19 is ignored by critics (H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu den Schriften Cäsars* [Jena 1886] has no entry for *Mars* in his otherwise most useful and scholarly work).

³⁸ The dramatic qualities noticed by Pascucci (above, note 35) and others should be analyzed in association with word-order, structure, and other stylistic devices Caesar lavishes on this piece. I depart from Seel's *pugnantes studio* to read *pugnae β*.

omnibus in locis pugnae se legionariis militibus praeferrent.

at hostes etiam in extrema spe salutis tantam virtutem praestiterunt

ut cum primi eorum cecidissent,

proximi iacentibus insisterent atque ex eorum corporibus pugnarent,

his deiectis et coacervatis cadaveribus

qui superessent ut ex tumulo tela in nostros coicerent

pilaque intercepta remitterent.

ut non nequiquam tantae virtutis homines iudicari deberet

ausos esse transire latissimum flumen,

ascendere altissimas ripas,

subire iniquissimum locum:

quae facilia ex difficillimis animi magnitudo redegerat. (B.G. II. 27)

The Roman forces are divided into three groups: wounded soldiers, non-combatants, and cavalry. Each is at the head of a complex syntactic unit, each needing to overcome a defect or disability. Balanced participial phrases (*vulneribus confecti* // *scutis innixi*) recreate the struggle of their transformation from incapacitated wounded to revived fighters. Previously frightened off themselves, the non-combatants, seeing the enemy in a panic, venture to attack an armed force, though themselves unarmed. The *perterritos* is momentarily ambiguous, but the collocation of *inermes armatis* puts the change of heart in sharp perspective. The equites, who have been guilty of manifest cowardice under attack, must overcome their strong sense of shame; that motivating force is expressed fully in the purpose clause (just as *vero* singles out their special problem in effecting a recovery), before their ubiquitous valor in battle is described. The audience is expected not to forget the impetus that motivates all three changes: *horum adventu* at the head of the sentence. Each member of the tricolon is itself both complex and perfectly rounded.

With *at* Caesar shifts to the enemy. The sentence describing the heroism of the Nervii is in clear balance, though *nostri* and *hostes* are not in parallel constructions. *Tantum . . . ut* echoes *tanta . . . ut* above; the magnitude in this passage is of virtue. As with the Roman forces, the enemy fighters are divided, for more obviously rhetorical reasons, into three groups: *primi*, *proximi*, and *qui superessent*—although the parallelism is patently not sustained—as wave after wave of Nervii sacrifice themselves bravely and functionally in a losing cause. The first two are combined in the *ut*-clause that characterizes their valor. The first to be slaughtered are subsumed in a *cum*-clause that interrupts *ut . . . proximi*. It is as if the narrator, forced by the rapidity of the action, looks past the first wave to the second. Now the narrator

switches to the third group, again referring to the previous one in a more subordinate construction; he insists on continuity. Meusel,³⁹ with no punctuation after *cadaveribus*, may be right in taking the participial phrase as dative and, therefore, clearly dependent on *superessent*, describing the situation vividly with the simile *ut ex tumulo* (cf. *ex eorum corporibus*). There is a tremendous sense of unceasing, relentless repetition, of inexorable determination on the part of the Nervii to fight to the last man. The total description is cumulative and capacious: capacious in the doubling of verbs and participles, for the constructions are tightly packed. The gesture of the Nervii may have been futile, but like the charge of the Light Brigade, it is the stuff of which military legend is made (while reflecting no discredit on the victorious general). Caesar can afford to reflect with admiration on such a sacrifice.

The summation comes, without rhetorical preparation, in a second *ut*-clause appended to the second period.⁴⁰ It is as formal as Caesar gets in the Commentaries.⁴¹ The parallelism is so symmetrical as to have caused suspicion and to be criticized by one scholar who tolerates it. The object of each infinitive in the tricolon is modified by a superlative adjective; the word-order is unvaried. In sharp contrast to the detail and complexity of what has preceded, the generalizing last clause, with its simple but effective play on *facilia* / / *difficillimis*, is a rhetorical as well as a structural decrescendo.

It would be previous to try to generalize from the above examples to a full and comprehensive statement about the style of Caesar even in the *De Bello Gallico* alone. Changes and developments of technique require a more detailed look at the context, intention, and place in the corpus. From the use and position of words to sentence typologies, patterns of preference will be observed displaying more idiosyncrasy than Caesar has ever been credited with. Close reading will permit, as in the above cases, some correlations to be discovered between

³⁹ F. Kraner, W. Dittenberger, H. Meusel, *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico* (Berlin 1972), *ad loc.*

⁴⁰ The second *ut*-clause is not co-ordinate with the first. See Meusel, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

⁴¹ One clear observation deriving from a close study of the text is that Caesar is more varied, less economical than is generally supposed; cf. Eden, *op. cit.*, p. 86, on one thought, one expression. The closest parallels I have found are these: VII. 19: *ut, qui propinquitatem loci videret, paratos prope aequo Marte ad dimicandum existimaret, qui iniquitatem condicionis perspiceret, inani simulatione sese ostentare cognosceret*; VII. 28: *labore operis incitati NON aetate confectis, NON mulieribus, NON infantibus pepercerunt*, but they are not conspicuously similar. They are, however, more formally balanced or anaphoric than anything else besides *B.G.* II. 27.

techniques of composition and desired effects. This is what I mean by practical criticism; it will be especially fruitful when applied to an author whose style is more admired through perfunctory labelling than close reading. Suffice it for now to say that if Caesar is still to be identified with the *genus humile*, that level of style must be expanded beyond the limitations imposed by, say, Cicero to include a composition that can be periodic, complex, and capable of great expressiveness through the use of varied and often subtle techniques.⁴²

University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

⁴² See H. C. Gotoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-31, on possible deception and disingenuity in Cicero's treatment of the *genus humile*. The model of the *tria genera dicendi* has its virtues for critical as well as polemical reasons, but in no case will the application of a label substitute for practical analysis and accurate definition of the stylistic features Caesar employs.

2

The New Gallus and the Origins of Latin Love Elegy¹

J. K. NEWMAN

In an amusing passage of his novel *Königliche Hoheit* (1909) Thomas Mann describes how Prince Klaus Heinrich nervously waits to bestow a literary prize on the poet Axel Martini, famous for his two volumes entitled *Evoe!* and *Sacred Life*. The poem which has won the prize is "an inspired hymn of praise to the joy of life, or rather a highly tempestuous outbreak of the joy of life itself, a ravishing hymn to the beauty and fearfulness of life. . . ."²

The interview however between Prince and poet, when it does eventually take place, is a series of anti-climaxes. The asthmatic Martini is in delicate health, a teetotaler who is normally in bed at ten every night. He explains that what distinguishes the artist is "hunger for the actual:"

"Enjoyment of life is forbidden to us, strictly forbidden, we have no illusions as to that—and by enjoyment of life I mean not only happiness, but also sorrow, passion, in short every serious tie with life. The representation of life claims all our forces, especially when those

¹ An earlier treatment of the new fragment is to be found in my "De novo Galli fragmento in Nubia eruto," *Latinitas* XXVIII. 2 (1980), pp. 83-94. Now as then I should like to acknowledge my dependence on the *editio princeps* by R. D. Anderson, P. J. Parsons, R. G. M. Nisbet, "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaşr Ibrîm," *Journal of Roman Studies* 69 (1979), pp. 125-55, and especially of course here on the work of Professor Nisbet. I am grateful to Professor John Miller for reading and commenting on a first version of some of the points made now, and to members of the Liverpool Latin Seminar of April 29, 1983, for starting several stimulating trains of thought.

² The English translation is adapted from that published by A. Cecil Curtis (London 1916), pp. 170 ff.

forces are not allotted to us in overabundant measure"—and Herr Martini coughed, his shoulders repeatedly shaking as he did so.

The prince is particularly surprised by Martini's use of the first person in his work:

"But your poem," said Klaus Heinrich, with some insistence. "Your prize poem to 'The Joy of Life', Herr Martini. . . . I've read it attentively. It deals on the one hand with misery and horrors, with the wickedness and cruelty of life . . . and on the other hand with the enjoyment of wine and fair women, does it not? . . ."

"And it's all," said Klaus Heinrich, "conceived in the form of 'I', in the first person, isn't it? And yet it is not founded on personal knowledge? You have not really experienced any of it yourself?"

"Very little, Royal Highness. Only quite trifling suggestions of it. No, the fact is rather the other way round—that, if I were the man to experience all that, I should not only not write such poems, but should also feel entire contempt for my present existence. . . ."

"For hygiene is what I and such as I most need—it is our whole ethics. But nothing is more unhygienic than life. . . ."

Clearly Mann in this passage is having a great deal of fun at a certain level with naive notions that poet and poem must be one. Fun, yes, but there are also here in his portrait of Martini some features which will recur in deeply tragic colors in the picture of Adrian Leverkühn drawn by *Doktor Faustus*,³ and this suggests that he is concerned with a permanent aspect of his view of the artist at work. What Mann writes therefore becomes a useful corrective to the "autobiographical fallacy," the belief that a poet using the pronoun 'I' is necessarily describing his direct personal experience. In fact, the 'I' in the context of a poem must always be as manipulable as the cut of a dress or the time of day. The point is made forcefully by the Formalist critic Boris Eichenbaum in his essay on "The Making of Gogol's *Overcoat*":⁴

. . . pas une seule phrase de l'œuvre littéraire *ne peut être en soi* une "expression" directe des sentiment personnels de l'auteur, mais elle est toujours construction et jeu. . . .

And Yu. Tynianov remarks about the love poems of one of Pushkin's contemporaries:⁵

³ And it would be Proust who remarked in *À la Recherche du Temps Perdu* that at every moment we must choose between health and sanity on the one hand, and spiritual pleasures on the other.

⁴ Quoted in *Théorie de la littérature*, ed. Tzvetan Todorov (Paris 1965), p. 228.

⁵ Todorov, p. 134. Batiushkov was a particular student of Tibullus: E. Lo Gatto, *Storia della letteratura russa* (Florence 1950), p. 123.

La poésie érotique de Batiouchkov est le fruit de son travail sur la langue poétique (cf. son discours "De l'influence de la poésie légère sur la langue"), et Viazemski a refusé avec raison de chercher la genèse de cette poésie dans la psychologie de l'auteur.

The Formalists' argument should not be one which surprises students of Aristotle's *Poetics*, since in the last analysis it is simply another way of claiming that the poet is not a historian. Whatever the ostensible impulse in "real life" for his work, the poet, precisely because of his separating talent, immediately moves away from the personal to the universal. His genius explores levels of communication where experience inextricably blends with imagination (*φαντασία*), and on them he will impose a hygienic order which is ultimately foreign.

To understand this is to feel some impatience with the traditional problem of "the origins of Latin love elegy." The "objective" Greek, the "subjective" Roman—these are mechanical categorizations, which have rightly been handled with increasing scepticism in recent scholarship.⁶ The secret of the Augustan—and Roman—parade of the poetic ego is the national preoccupation with the present. What for the Greek vanished with the past, for the Roman is instantly recoverable, as myth is re-enacted in experience, and experience is reshaped by myth.⁷ So far from finding the missing link between Greek and Roman sensibility in some Roman poet who is half "objective" and half "subjective," we should expect all Roman poets, in so far as they are Roman, to behave alike. And the mystery of the origins of Latin love elegy is to be solved by looking in that most Roman of genres, satire, and especially in the work of Lucilius.⁸

Axel Martini was probably far more like Propertius than Gallus, engineer, general, administrator and *bon viveur*. But since Gallus has so often been cast in the role of missing link, it is worthwhile to note that the new papyrus is particularly instructive in showing just how

⁶ Cf. my *Augustus and the New Poetry* (Brussels 1967), pp. 356-71; M. Puelma, "Die Aitien des Kallimachos als Vorbild der römischen Amores-Elegie," *Mus. Helveticum* 39 (1982), pp. 221-46 and 285-304; R. Whitaker, *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy*, *Hypomnemata* 76 (Göttingen 1983).

⁷ "Denn wir wandeln in Spuren, und alles Leben ist Ausfüllung mythischer Formen mit Gegenwart": Thomas Mann, *Joseph in Aegypten*, *Ges. Werke* IV (1960), p. 819. Some of the application of this to the interpretation of Latin literature is discussed in "Memini Me Fiere Pavum: Ennius and the Quality of the Roman Aesthetic Imagination," *ICS* VIII (1982), pp. 173-93.

⁸ M. Puelma, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt 1949), pp. 266 ff. This explains the prosodic hiatus of Gallus' *tūm erunt* (v. 2), shared with Horace's *Satires* (*nūm adest*, II. 2. 28. A. Palmer *ad loc.* suggests that Horace is quoting Lucilius).

calculating a poetry is written by this so-called "subjective" elegist. Evidently, as the papyrus begins, the poet has been given a sad time by his mistress' wantonness. But his *fata* will be *dulcia* when Caesar fulfils some vast program of conquest,⁹ and returns to Rome to set his spoils in the temples of many gods. *Fata dulcia* is an astonishing paradox. Most of the time the Romans hardly thought so well of fate, and Virgil built the fourth book of the *Aeneid* on an opposition between these very concepts (culminating in *dulces exuviae, dum fata deusque sinebat*, 651).

Fata dulcia is therefore in Gallus a powerful oxymoron, which seems to be unique in Latin.¹⁰ Propertius knew the resonance of the noun. But not even he ventured such a combination. Such is the transforming power Gallus attributes to Caesar's coming pre-eminence.

None of the other elegists makes a statement remotely like this. Their poetic pose strikes a contrast between the joys of love and peace, and the harshness of war, with the palm always going to the former. No one of them suggests for a moment that the *nequitia* of his mistress can somehow be compensated for by the ostentation of public victory. But Gallus is excited by just such pomp. Caesar will be the *maxima pars* of Roman *historia*. Evidently, in taking over this Greek word from rhetorical theory (where it is so often featured, for example, in Cicero), Gallus invented a pentameter ending which was destined to *faire fortune*.¹¹ Even Virgil's Aeneas claims only to have been *pars magna* of the battles at the fall of Troy. Gallus' Caesar, *maxima pars*, is greater than Aeneas: *Auguste, Hectoreis cognite maior*

⁹ This is what Propertius understands by *historia* at III. 4. 10; 22. 20: see M. C. J. Putnam, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 39 (1980), pp. 51-55. Gallus and he present the maximum contrast with e.g. Hermesianax 7. 22, where J. U. Powell (*Collectanea Alexandrina*, repr. Oxford 1970, p. 104) offers the translation "doctrina." But now we learn that Gallus shares Propertius' liking for rhyming pentameter halves with Hermesianax: cf. H. Patzer, *Mus. Helveticum* 12 (1955), pp. 77-95, "Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters." I owe this last point to Frances S. Newman.

¹⁰ The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* lists no other instance.

¹¹ See Nisbet's note. The ending does not occur in Tibullus, and Ovid's usages (*Am.* II. 4. 44: *Tr.* II. 416 and 444: *Ibis* 57 and 520) are not significant. By contrast, Propertius has four final pentameter examples of the Gallan type. Two of them are mentioned above, note 9. The others are II. 1. 16 and III. 20. 28. Of these, the first is evidently a challenge to the "official" Gallan sense: cf. *causas* (= *Aetia*), v. 12: *Iliadas*, v. 14. Propertius is listing different styles of poetry and explaining that, in his case, they are always inspired by love. The second uses *historia* in the sense of the French "une histoire," already familiar to Plautus. The "official" sense was still strongly enough felt however to be parodied by the author of *Catalepton* 11. 6 and to be exploited by Martial in his eulogy of Sallust (XIV. 191. 2).

avis, as Propertius will put it later (IV. 6. 38), in another typically Roman assertion of the superiority of the present to the past.

It is against this background of flattery that we must judge the extraordinary hexameter which follows: *postque tuum reditum multorum templa deorum* The late Mr. Geary of Corpus at Oxford used to illustrate how not to write Latin verses by citing from the prolific Anon. the half line *mox venit atrox nox*. Has Gallus been to school with that shy master?

No, because he is too calculating a poet. We are in a religious context, something which is never far from the Roman mind when flattery of the great is in the air. *Multorum templa deorum* sets the scene. But so does *reditus*. The "return" of a general or monarch was no ordinary event either in the hellenistic world or at Rome. In the hellenistic world, it may be associated with the whole concept of *παρουσία*.¹² The visiting grandee heralded a fresh beginning for the people he so honored. New buildings greeted the arrival.¹³ In its religious aspect, this visit could mean an end to sorrow.¹⁴ Just so, Gallus expects richer temples and an end to his *tristia*, indeed their transformation into *dulcia*, with Caesar's *reditus*.

The *Res Gestae* of Augustus confirm the religious nature of another *reditus*:

Aram Fortunae Reducis ante aedes Honoris et Virtutis ad portam Capenam pro **reditu** meo senatus consecravit, in qua pontifices et virgines Vestales anniversarium sacrificium facere iussit eo die quo in urbem ex Syria **redieram** (R.G. 11)

Similarly, "the most important iconographic evidence for Augustan

¹² *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, begründet von Gerhard Kittel . . . herausgegeben von Gerhard Friedrich, vol. 5 (Stuttgart 1953), s.v. *παρουσία* (A. Oepke). It should be noted that this concept covers also that of "Second Coming." M. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* II (Munich 1961), pp. 391-92, notes the long history of these ideas. For example, the return of Vespasian to Rome as emperor was celebrated by Domitian on frieze B of the so-called "Chancery Reliefs" preserved in the Vatican. The winged Victory shown holding a crown of oak leaves over the emperor's head picks up a theme which goes all the way back to the coins of Gelon and to Pindar's religious eulogy of Hiero in the opening lines of *Pythian* 2. Cf. Colin M. Kraay and M. Hirmer, *Greek Coins* (New York 1966), plates 25, 26, 28. The motif is preserved on a brown sardonyx cameo of the fourth century after Christ: cf. "Triumphal Procession of a Christian Emperor," reproduced as figure 7 in *History of the Byzantine State* by G. Ostrogorsky, Eng. tr. Joan Hussey (repr. Oxford 1980).

¹³ Oepke, p. 858, using examples drawn from Hadrian's visit to Greece. These included a new temple of Athena.

¹⁴ "Alles Leiden wird überwunden sein . . .," Oepke, p. 860. Cf. NT *Rev.* 7:17; 21:4 and Pindar's *ἄδακρυν*, *O.* 2. 66.

ideals and propaganda," according to P. A. Brunt and J. M. Moore,¹⁵ is associated with another *reditus*:

Cum ex Hispania Galliaque . . . Romam **redi** . . . aram Pacis Augustae
senatus pro **reditu** meo consacranda censuit ad campum Martium
. . . . (R.G. 12)

It is to this last return that Horace refers in one of the most beautiful of his *Odes*, supplying us with evidence of the religious sentiment connected with such occasions from the very heart of political and poetic orthodoxy:

Divis orte bonis, optime Romulae
Custos¹⁶ gentis, abes iam nimium diu.
Maturum **reditum** pollicitus patrum
Sancto concilio, **redi**. (IV. 5. 1-4)

The final imperative here may be compared with the *ἐρχου* which comes at the end of the Book of Revelation (22:20) and therefore at the end of the New Testament. The "Messianic" language of *Eclogue* 4, the "kenotic" language of *Odes* I. 2,¹⁷ forms then part of an Augustan pattern.

What is fascinating about Horace's flatteries in *Odes* IV. 5 is that they show exactly the same sort of assonance as Gallus'. Yet we know that Horace is perfectly able to use the plural of *reditus* to avoid such a jingle when he wants: *et populum reditus morantem* (*Odes* III. 5. 52).

Horace's assonance occurs in a religious context. Kiessling—Heinze connect the ode with the well-known fragment of Ennius (110-14 V) in which Romulus' death is lamented: *o sanguen dis oriundum*. There is a propaganda intent in this echo, since Augustus had at one time entertained the idea of taking the name of Romulus, and Romulus was pointedly visible in an *exedra* of his Forum. Certainly *patrum / sancto concilio, redi* fits in with this religious solemnity. May we then not now hear in Gallus' assonance too, rather than the discord of an incompetent, the notes of a religious exaltation, given expression in the age-old device of rhyme? The twist given to *fixa*, the opulent sonority of the comparative *divitiora*, assume new significance. The organist, as we draw near to these temples, is pulling out all his stops.¹⁸

¹⁵ *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (repr. Oxford 1979), p. 53.

¹⁶ On *custos* here, E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (Lund—Leipzig 1939), pp. 156-57; cf. 169-71.

¹⁷ Nisbet—Hubbard on v. 43.

¹⁸ Professor Nisbet already points out in his *editio princeps* (above, note 1), pp. 141-42, that the anaphora of second person pronouns and adjectives in vv. 2-5 of our fragment (*tu . . . tuum . . . tuis*) is particularly suitable to a hymnic panegyric.

Templa . . . legam also speaks of serious themes. The organizers of a recent exhibition dedicated to the *Image of Augustus* at the British Museum point to the conscious propaganda which sought in the 30's to recreate Octavian in the likeness of a hellenistic prince.¹⁹ A theme of this propaganda, still echoing in Horace,²⁰ was the construction of temples. A gold coin which may belong to this period depicts on its obverse a bust of Diana, and on its reverse a tetrastyle temple whose pediment is adorned with a triskelis which associates it with the Sicilian victory over Sex. Pompeius in 36. Within the temple, a naval and military trophy is set on a prow. On its architrave is the inscription IMP. CAESAR. As early as 40, Octavian had begun to drop his praenomen Caius, and to assume in its place the honorific *imperator* which had been voted to Julius Caesar as a title which he might hand down to his heirs.²¹

Another *aureus*, from the British Museum exhibition, dated about 36, shows a temple inscribed DIVO IUL.²² This temple was dedicated in 29 in the Forum. The *aureus* mentioned earlier may allude to the temple of the Palatine Apollo, dedicated the following year.²³ It should be observed however that it is not a question of waiting for actual dedications, with appropriate inscriptions on their architraves, to take place. We are dealing with poetry, and flattery, and Gallus' allusion to *multorum templa deorum* fits perfectly with a propaganda campaign already being waged on Octavian's coins. In the proem to the third *Georgic*, Gallus' friend and admirer Virgil was shortly to fantasize just such another temple.

36 was in fact a key year in the unfolding of Octavian's career.²⁴

¹⁹ *The Image of Augustus* by Susan Walker and Andrew Burnett, British Museum Publications (1981), pp. 18-19.

²⁰ *Odes* III. 6. 2: *donec templa refeceris*. Already in 28 (*consul sextum*) Augustus claims *duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sextum ex decreto senatus refeci, nullo praetermisso quod eo tempore refici debebat* (R.G. 20. 4). K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich 1960), p. 294, notes this as part of Augustus' policy: *templorum omnium conditor ac restitutor*, Livy IV. 20. 7.

²¹ These details are taken from Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, Conn. 1931), p. 132 with fig. 20.

²² British Museum Occasional Paper No. 16, *Augustus*, by Susan Walker and Andrew Burnett (1981), p. 2, no. 10.

²³ So L. R. Taylor, *loc. cit.* Cf. Victor deinde Caesar reversus in urbem . . . templumque Apollinis et circa porticus facturum promisit, quod ab eo singulari exstructum munificentia est: Velleius Pat. II. 81. 3: cf. P. J. Enk's notes in his introduction to Propertius II. 31.

²⁴ On the *reditus* of 36 B.C. in general, cf. V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit* (Leipzig 1891), pp. 285-86: R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939), pp. 233-

When he returned to Rome to celebrate an *ovatio* after his great victories over Sex. Pompeius and Lepidus, he was met with a series of honorary decrees. Some he declined. Others, which he did accept, had already been given to Julius. Among them was the bestowal of the laurel crown. Meanwhile, under the able lieutenancy of Maecenas and Agrippa, a far-reaching program of rebuilding and reconstruction was put in hand. Virgil began to write the *Georgics*, which originally ended with the *laudes Galli*. Of course we do not know what Gallus himself was doing during this exciting time when Octavian was winning the hearts and minds of the Italian populace. We do know that he was an engineer (*praefectus fabrum*).

It is hard to believe that Octavian never talked intimately to his friends and associates before and during 36 about his plans for the future. These four lines of the papyrus may preserve the memory of just such stimulating conversation: the refurbishing of "many temples"; the dedication of spoils, whether these were literal trophies or simply *manubiae*, a word which will not scan in dactylic verse.²⁵ Velleius at least hints that the spoils from Naulochus led on to the temple of the Palatine Apollo, so important for the Augustan *vates*.

Gallus foresees that he will "read" these temples. It is of course possible that he knew he would be away from Rome, and would have to content himself with written accounts. But when he was in Egypt he certainly knew the value of public inscriptions, and that from Philae is still preserved. May he not therefore be thinking of himself as "rubber-necking," just as Propertius later proposes to read the

34. The official line on Sex. Pompeius was that he was a renegade and pirate: cf. *minatus urbi vincla*, Horace, *Epod.* 9. 9: *mare pacavi a praedonibus*, Aug. *R.G.* 25 with Brunt and Moore's notes. *Spolia* then would have been quite properly taken from such a foe. But in fact Gallus' language is, I think, deliberately misleading: cf. below, note 25. *Spolia* are confounded with *dona ex manubiis*. — Scholars now varyingly date the publication of the *Eclogues* to 37 (C. G. Hardie, *The Georgics: A Transitional Poem* [Abingdon 1971], p. 9) or even 35 (D. O. Ross, Jr., *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* [Cambridge 1975], p. 18, note 1, with reference to articles by G. W. Bowersock and W. V. Clausen). The argument for an earlier date because Maecenas is not mentioned deserves as much attention as most *argumenta ex silentio*. In any case the ancient concept of "publication" was much vaguer than ours (when was the *Aeneid* published?), and Gallus may easily have shared his poetry with his close friend Virgil before it went out to a wider circle. Cf. G. P. Goold, *ICS* VIII (1983), pp. 96-97 on publication dates in Ovid.

²⁵ "Poetam credo consulto *spolia* proprio sensu dicta, et latiore sensu dicta *dona ex manubiis* (Aug. *R.G.* 21) confudisse": "De novo Galli fragmento" (above, note 1), p. 86. Cf. *sacratas ab Augusto manubias*, Tac. *Ann.* II. 53 of the temple of Apollo at Actium. There were however spoils in the temple of Mars Ultor: Ovid, *Fasti* V. 561-62.

names of the cities Octavian has captured when they are displayed in his triumph? Could Gallus not "read temples" quite literally, just as we still read IMP. CAESAR and DIVO IUL. on the temples depicted on the *aurei* contemporary with Gallus?²⁶

Gallus may *read* temples, but he has also *written* something, as with precise antithetical logic he now goes on to inform us (vv. 6-7). And no ordinary poems either. They have "at last," which is presumably some homage to the Alexandrian *ponos*-ideal, been made by the Muses, so that he can say they are worthy of his mistress. No small compliment to Lycoris, if she can command such talent! And no small compliment to the poet, if he is able to claim such inspiration!

But "made by the Muses" is a critical catchword, which vexes Horace when some *fautor veterum* applies it to archaic Latin monuments of letters. Elsewhere in the *Epistles* it springs to the lips of a Roman Callimachus. Varro had said something similar about Plautus, according to Quintilian.²⁷ But, if Gallus employs a *critical* catchword of this kind, can we not say that he is the first *iudex* of his own verses? *Historia* already revealed the student of rhetoric.²⁸

In this fragmentary final section we obviously enter into an area of great controversy. My article in *Latinitas* suggests that a sustained metaphor is drawn from the Roman courts. *Dicere* (v. 7) and *iudice* (v. 9) may be united in this way, and if we accept Professor Nisbet's *testatur* at 8 that verb would support this line of interpretation. Someone is being asked to come to "the same" (*idem* looks secure) verdict. I believe that this someone is Caesar.²⁹ No one else is really

²⁶ Cf. *et titulis oppida capta legam*, Prop. III. 4. 16. In describing the temple of Mars Ultor in the *Fasti*, Ovid writes: *Spectat et Augusto praetextum nomine templum, / Et visum lecto Caesare maius opus* (V. 567-68). Gallus will read a written text on either view, of course. It is simply a question of what is more consistent with the poetic and Roman imagination. The evidence of Propertius and Ovid in this regard is far more important than that of the author of *Cons. ad Liviam* 267.

²⁷ X. 1. 99; cf. Hor. *Epp.* II. 1. 27 *dictitet Albano Musas in monte locutas: Epp.* II. 2. 92. On this latter passage Kiessling—Heinze adduce Crinagoras (*A.P.* IX. 545), who is himself echoing (and reversing) Antipater of Thessaly on the *Thebaid* of Antimachus.

²⁸ And, though *iudex* may have Alexandrian antecedents (*κρίνεις*, *Aet.*-pref. 18 dub.) its intrusion at this point into Gallus' elegy is extraordinary. This was obviously not the beginning of a book, where so many allusions to "judging," including Callimachus', seem to come, and apparently at some remove from the end. The use of *ἐγκρίνειν* is no parallel at all, since it is clearly not a *poet's* word in Alexandria. One is reminded of Cicero on Calvus: *nimum tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans*, *Brutus* 82. 283.

²⁹ And I would restore, not *testatur*, but another judicial verb, *videatur*, and before that SEI· CAESAR·.

good enough to fill the bill, and Caesar is certainly invoked as *iudex* of literature by both Horace and Ovid.³⁰

It is possible to conjecture therefore that in this extraordinary fragment Gallus was writing with more political inspiration than might appear. Octavian's campaign against Sex. Pompeius was very far from successful in its early stages, and not wholly welcome anyway to Pompey's old friends and supporters back in Rome. There was even a moment before the final victory, after the wreck off Scyllaeum, when Octavian was denied supplies by the Senate.³¹ Eventually private donors came to his aid. Gallus may have lent his pen to enhance his patron's appeal to the wavering, just as later Augustan poets would.

The tantalizing *Tyria* could fit just such an interpretation. "Tyrian" purple may not have been known long at Rome when Gallus was writing. Pliny quotes Cornelius Nepos to the effect that P. Lentulus Spinther was the first to use *dibapha Tyria* for his *praetexta* in 63.³² The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* cites "Tyrius" in the meaning "purple" from Cicero's *Pro Flacco* (59) and Catullus 61. 165 (before 54). Pliny notes that Romulus' *trabea* was purple, and the *trabea* is important to Virgil.³³ Gallus might have alluded to this, as part of an Octavian / Romulus equation, and this would explain why Horace associates a *reditus* with Romulus.³⁴ Romulus was certainly connected with the Palatine, just like Octavian, who also began his building operations there.³⁵

There is also the question of Lycoris' change of name. It is not methodologically sound to be always asking who "Cynthia" or "Delia" (or for that matter "Beatrix" or "Laura") "really" were,³⁶ but if it is right to identify Lycoris with Volumnia, how is it that Gallus has changed her professional name from the earlier "Cytheris" to "Lycoris," from Aphrodite to Apollo? No doubt he may, as a poet, have had an interest in Apollo.³⁷ But Octavian had an even bigger one! It is too convenient.

³⁰ *Sat.* II. 1. 83-84: *sed bona [carmina] si quis / iudice condiderit laudatus Caesare: Fasti* I. 19-20: *pagina iudicium docti subitura movetur / principis.*

³¹ Gardthausen, *Augustus und seine Zeit* (above, note 24), pp. 245 ff., esp. p. 252.

³² *N.H.* IX. 39. 63.

³³ *Aen.* VII. 612. For Augustus / Romulus, cf. Gardthausen, pp. 543-45; Walker—Burnett, *The Image of Augustus* (above, note 19), p. 31.

³⁴ Above, p. 24.

³⁵ Velleius, above, note 23; Livy I. 7. 3, *Palatium primum . . . muniit* (Romulus).

³⁶ D. O. Ross has said all that is necessary: *op. cit.* (above, note 24), p. 100, note 1.

³⁷ See G. Lieberg, "Die Muse des Properz und seine Dichterweihe," *Philologus* 107 (1963), pp. 116 ff.

Our fragment was evidently written by an ambitious soldier-politician, who would rise *ex infima fortuna* to be viceroy of Egypt, and who in real life would be very unlikely to burn his wings on Mark Antony's old flame (*non fuit opprobrio celebrasse Lycorida Gallo*). Gallus was too much in love with himself to have much time for the love of a woman, and even perhaps eventually for the love of the Muse. In this sense, his subjectivity ultimately negated rather than defined his art. It was useful for him to be able to disarm criticism by casting himself in the comic role of the frustrated lover.³⁸ But his mercurial temperament thrived on opposites. Lycoris was convenient foil. Against her *nequitia* (more of the *iudex* here!) could be set the glorious promise of the new regime, when *tristia* would become *fata dulcia*.

How dangerous therefore to present Gallus as some sort of bridge into a new "subjective" Roman style of elegy, especially if the unconscious analogy at work is some version of Shelley's skylark, "That from heaven or near it / Pourest thy full heart / In profuse strains of unpremeditated art." Even worse would be the uncritical assumption that poets are just "ordinary chaps" who happen to write verses. Fine art can only be the work of genius (Kant). Gallus certainly had genius. What he lacked was commitment.

Gallus was interested—too interested for Aristotle—in *historia*, in both judging and having the judgment of others on his verses. He lavished flattery on the man who could make his career. He trailed his poetic ego (*mihi . . . mea*, v. 2; *ego*, v. 8) across the stage of Augustan literary and political history, but not because he was fatally enamoured of Lycoris (as Virgil's theatrical *indigno cum Gallus amore peribat* might lead the unwary to believe). That was what Mann calls "hygiene," and what ancient literary theory calls *ὑπόκρισις* and *προσωποποιία*. Rather, he wanted to make an impression. He did, and when he fell from his giddy eminence, his self-dramatizing suicide was the crowning gesture of his histrionic and too vulnerable talent.

University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

³⁸ This need not mean "laughable," of course. Servius says of *Aeneid* IV "paene comicus stilus est: nec mirum ubi de amore tractatur." Perhaps Dido, with her intense capacity for identification with theatrical heroines, is Gallus' greatest contribution to Augustan love-poetry.

3

Propertius Book IV: Themes and Structures*

J. P. SULLIVAN

Book IV has always presented problems for critics of Propertius. Despite Propertius' professed adherence to Callimachean poetic canons (III. 1. 1), it is only here that we encounter aetiological ventures along the lines of the *Aetia*, and not many at that. Also, despite the rejection of Cynthia for her wicked ways (III. 24 and 25), she returns in IV. 7 and 9 both as a ghost and as a haunting memory.

Some have taken Book IV as Propertius' concession to Augustan pressures. Ronald Syme says:

Even Propertius was not untouched by the patriotic theme, or the repeated insistences of Maecenas. For all his dislike of war, he could turn away from his love and lover's melancholy to celebrate with fervour, and with no small air of conviction, the War of Actium, or to plead in solemn tones for the avenging of Crassus.¹

On this view Book IV represents Propertius' compromise between his Callimachean poetic and the pressing demand for patriotic poetry on the grander scale of Virgil and Horace. So, we are to believe, Propertius began the first sketches of a Roman *Aetia*, represented by elegies 2, 4, 9, and 10 of Book IV, but unfortunately foundered in any more ambitious aetiological undertaking, perhaps akin to Ovid's *Fasti*, because this sort of writing did not suit his talent or his emotional

* This is a revised version of a seminar paper presented at Vanderbilt University (1982).

¹*Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1960), pp. 466 ff.

inclination. It should be noted that even the *Fasti* was not completed, though Ovid had a great deal of poetic energy left.

It has been argued² that Book IV represents a subtle *recusatio*, a defiance of Augustan demands, a disguised reiteration of such elegies as II. 7, exulting in the defeat of Augustus' law forcing bachelors to marry. Propertius' tackling, in elegy IV. 10, of the tricky question of the *spolia opima*, a subject hotly debated at the time, seems to support this thesis. A more tactful or patriotic poet would have avoided such a theme.

As for the elegy Syme relies on for his judgment, the well-known and often defended, elegy IV. 6 (*Sacra facit vates*),³ this may be seen in its hyperbole as a parody of Horace's famous Cleopatra ode (*Nunc est bibendum*, I. 37), which by its sheer exaggeration would do little for the reputation of the victor of Actium. The reader could hardly fail to note the absurd exaggeration of *one* arrow from Apollo's bow sinking ten ships and so the whole piece can be interpreted as an exercise in irony, a familiar poetic mode in our poet.⁴ So Propertius is having it both ways, saying, in effect, "Augustus, I've given you a victory elegy; I've tried to honor Rome with some Callimachean aetiology, explaining our Etruscan roots in the Vertumnus elegy, and condemning Tarpeia for her infidelity to Rome. But I'm not really suited to the 'patriot game', so leave me to my own devices and visions. Use your more compliant poets, such as Virgil and Horace, instead of me. The first poet is not really Callimachean except in his early work and the second I dislike as much as he does me (*quis nisi Callimachus?* Hor. *Epp.* II. 2. 100); which is why we do not mention each other except by oblique and slighting references, the only possible treatment of an enemy. Who would wish to immortalize him in one's verse?"

This is not an impossible view of Propertius' poetic strategy, and we have to bear in mind also that there is a dispute as to whether Book IV was put out by Propertius as his last *magnum opus* or whether some learned friend gathered the pieces on his desk or in his *scrinium* and did the best he could with the disparate poems that were Propertius' final legacy to posterity.

Now obviously one cannot exclude the possibility that a friend, sensitive to Propertius' *œuvre*, and so skilled in arrangement, could

² J. P. Sullivan, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge 1976), pp. 134 ff.

³ W. R. Johnson, "The Emotions of Patriotism: Propertius 4. 6," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 6 (1973), pp. 151 ff.

⁴ E. Lefevre, *Propertius Ludibundus: Elemente des Humors in seinen Elegien* (Heidelberg 1966), pp. 63 ff.

produce a book that the poet would have been proud of, but the chronology of Propertius' life is such that his fourth book could easily have been edited and published by the writer himself. We know from Ovid that he was dead at the latest by 2 B.C., but there are indications that Book IV was published in or a short time after 16 B.C. The poet may then have married and given to the ungrateful world descendants that included Passennus Paulus, himself an elegist, who claimed, according to the younger Pliny, that he was related by birth to Propertius.

My thesis then is that Propertius himself edited and arranged Book IV of his poems with exquisite care and that it shows the same art of *variatio* and structure that was displayed in the popular *Monobiblos*.⁵

Few, I think, would disagree, after examining the exasperating state of the text of Propertius Book II, that Lachmann was right in claiming that Propertius wrote five books of elegies, not four. No ancient poet would ever have produced such a messy collection as Propertius' second book as we now have it. How the damage happened—careless scribes, book-worms, badly protected monasteries—need not concern us here, not to mention the less significant damage inflicted by time on our present Book III. I am simply arguing that Book IV is as carefully organized as the *Monobiblos*, that gift frequently sent to friends by Martial's contemporaries at the *Saturnalia*.

What then are we to conclude about the editing of Book IV? First, we have to accept the principle that, whether Propertius or a sympathetic learned friend put the book together, it is an impressive work of art. In my view Propertius was the editor, but the notion of its editing by a sensitive poetic friend cannot be excluded.

Now we come to the question of structure. With a few exceptions, which can often be explained away, ancient authors had their favorite or standard units for a book. Except, if you wish, Valerius Martial, who tossed together his *libelli*, directed towards patrons initially, for public consumption in the cold days of the *Saturnalia*. Normally, however, prose and verse writers (such as Livy with his decades of histories, Virgil with his ten *Eclogues*, his four *Georgics*, and his twelve books of the *Aeneid*, Horace with his three carefully crafted books of *Odes*) had in mind a numerical symmetry, which might be deliberately broken by the occasional *coda* or *sphragis* of the sort we see in the *Monobiblos*.

Eleven is, I suggest, a difficult number to accept as a structure for

⁵ See the careful analysis by O. Skutsch, "The Structure of the Propertian *Monobiblos*," *Classical Philology* 58 (1963), pp. 238 ff.

Propertius' Book IV. But if we comprehend the poetic technique of the diptych, then we have a key to the structure of Book IV.⁶ Ovid's diptych on Cypassis (*Am.* II. 8) is of course the most famous example of this technique, where Ovid protests to Corinna that he couldn't possibly sleep with a slave and therefore her suspicions are groundless, and then in the next poem blackmails the slave to sleep with him again since, if she does not, he will tell her mistress about their relationship.

Propertius had already used this structure in Book I: numbered by editors as 8A and 8B. 8A begins with *Tune igitur demens* and 8B starts with *Hic erit! hic iurata manet*: a proclamation that Cynthia, who was about to leave with some richer lover for cold climes, now has decided to stay with the lovesick poet. Turn now to Book IV. In the opening elegy, or rather the two opening elegies, Propertius states boldly that he will produce a sort of *Fasti* for patriotic Roman readers: he ends, with appropriate solemnity and a rich poetic cadence, highly suitable for the close of a poem, with these lines (69-70):

sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum:
has meus ad metas sudet oportet equus.

The astrologer Horos then chides Propertius for abandoning his proper *métier*: love poetry. He gives Propertius' biography as well as his own credentials as an astrologer, but essentially it is a complement, not a supplement, to Propertius' vainglorious boast, however ironic, that he is to become a national poet, or should we say an "Augustan" poet? If we think in terms of the diptych, already established in Propertius' *œuvre*, then we find that Book IV yields us twelve, not eleven poems, which would be consonant with the practices of Roman poets. For surely by our present numbering the first elegy is overlong by any standards (150 lines by comparison with the next longest, 102 lines, and the shortest 48 lines).

Assuming now that Propertius Book IV is neatly divided into 12 poems, what can we say of its theme and structuring around that theme? I would suggest that the theme is *fides*.

Propertius begins (IV. 1) with professing that he is abandoning his chosen theme of love and moving on to his new profession of glorifying Rome in his own inimitable Callimachean way. In the opening, programmatic diptych the wise Horos tells him, as Apollo has told him before (III. 3), that his genius is for elegiac love poetry, that *fallax opus*, not epic or the more ambitious genres.

⁶ See now J. T. Davis, *Dramatic Pairings in the Elegies of Propertius and Ovid* (Bern and Stuttgart 1980).

A tentative structural diagram would then look like this, if we agree that the theme is *fides*:

1. Propertius attempts to break faith with his poetic *métier*.
2. Horos advises him to return to his primary allegiance.
3. Vertumnus, keeping himself the same, or keeping the faith beneath his many guises, and not least keeping himself true to the Etruscan influences on Rome.
4. Arethusa's love letter to Lycotas (*haecne marita fides*, IV. 3. 11).
5. The vestal Tarpeia's breach of faith with her religion and Rome.
6. *Lena* poem: examples of fidelity, e.g. Penelope, cited (*sperne fidem* IV. 5. 27).
7. Actium poem (*vincit Roma fide Phoebi*, IV. 6. 57).
8. The ghost of Cynthia indignantly proclaims her fidelity to Propertius (*me servasse fidem*, IV. 7. 53) and his infidelity to her (IV. 7. 13—*perfide*; IV. 7. 70—*perfidiae*).
9. Propertius' futile attempt at infidelity with Phyllis and Teia.
10. The Hercules elegy (*non infido . . . hospite Caco*, v. 7), which makes much of the violation of the *fides* of hospitality.
11. Jupiter Feretrius and the *spolia opima*.
12. The sublime example of *fides*, the dead *univira* Cornelia addressing her husband Paullus.⁷

It is true that poets, unlike scholars, do not seek mechanistic structures around which to mold their work, yet I would argue that the theme of *fides* in various forms is the keystone of Book IV, although other grace notes can sometimes be heard—of defiance, irony, and the refusal to bow to pressure. Yet these too represent a form of *fides* to one's chosen *métier*, or to one's life-long mistress.

University of California, Santa Barbara

⁷ Schmeisser's *Concordance* to Propertius informs us that Book 1 produces 6 examples of the word *fides*: Book II, 6; Book III, 11; and Book IV, 10.

4

Some Elucidations of Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*

PETER HOWELL

Reference is made to the commentaries of L. Friedlaender (2nd edition, Leipzig 1906), A. Maiuri (Naples 1945), and Martin S. Smith (Oxford 1975).

27.3 matellam: it needs to be made clear that a *matella* was for use by a *man* (like a hospital "bottle"). See *TLL* s.v.; Daremberg—Saglio s.v. *amis* with fig. 257; and my note on Martial I. 37 (*A Commentary on Book I of the Epigrams of Martial* [London 1980]). Hence its use at dinner-parties, whereas the *lasanum* or chamber-pot would only be used in private (cf. 41. 9). (The obnoxious Cynic at Luc. *Symp.* 35 presumably urinated on the floor.)

30.3 si bene memini: an interesting touch of narrative realism (the only one of its kind?). For the colloquial use of the phrase see J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*³ (Heidelberg 1951), pp. 107, 198.

30.3-4 et duae tabulae . . . notabantur: a calendar painted on the walls of a portico has recently been discovered below S. Maria Maggiore in Rome. Giving information about rural activities, dates of games, elections, etc., it dates from the 4th century A.D. See F. Magi, *Il Calendario Dipinto sotto S. Maria Maggiore* (Vatican City 1972). Magi—who claims that the building was a market—states that Trimalchio's calendar "non ha assolutamente nulla a che fare col nostro," but J. Reynolds (*Journal of Roman Studies* 66 [1976], pp. 247-

48) argues that it might have been a luxurious private house, which would make the comparison significant.

31.2 vinum dominicum: Hadas' explanation is on the right lines (*American Journal of Philology* 50 [1929], p. 379): he cites an Aramaic proverb, "The wine is the master's, the thanks the butler's." Zielinski (*Philologus* 64 [1905], p. 20) had already argued from *Ar. Eq.* 1205 for the existence of a similar Greek proverb. There is surely no reference to the *inaequalis cena*, as some editors suggest. Buecheler pointed out that the words *vinum . . . est* form a senarius, which also hints at a proverbial origin.

34.4 vinum: the idea of washing the hands in undiluted wine is intentionally absurd.

37.10 in rutae folium coniciet: Friedlaender's explanation is the only one that makes sense—namely, that *rutae folium* was proverbial for a confined space (compare "I'll beat you into a cocked hat"). Hadas (p. 380) compares a rabbinic phrase "a leaf of myrtle." It is worth pointing out that a rue leaf is in fact extremely small (which is why Martial chooses it at *XI. 18. 4*).

38.16 conturbare: it is important to emphasize that this means, not "to go bankrupt," but "to go fraudulently bankrupt": see Fordyce's note on *Catullus 5. 11*.

45.8 matella: the fact that this was for use by men (see above on *27. 3*) gives the insult extra point. (At *Plaut. Pers.* 533 *matula* is addressed to a *leno*.)

47.10 oenococtos: does the joke depend on the *amount* of wine needed to cook a calf (as compared with *coq au vin*—*74. 4*)?

57.3 sed in molli carne vermes nascuntur: the best sense that can be extracted from these words (*pace* F. R. D. Goodyear, *Proceedings of the African Classical Association* 14 [1978], p. 54) seems to be that they apply to Ascylos, who is disparagingly referred to as *mollis*: just as, when meat is hung so that it will become tender, maggots tend to breed in it, so Ascylos' "tender flesh" breeds worms.

57.4 regis filius: cf. *Cic. Lael.* 70: *ut in fabulis, qui aliquamdiu propter ignorationem stirpis et generis in famulatu fuerunt, cum cogniti sunt et aut deorum aut regum filii inventi, retinent tamen caritatem in pastores, quos patres multos annos esse duxerunt*. This suggests that the phrase may have been almost proverbial. The case of Pallas, which editors compare, is less striking in that he claimed only to be of royal descent.

57.4 ipse me dedi in servitutum: see now J. Ramin and P. Veyne, "Droit romain et société: les hommes libres qui passent pour esclaves et l'esclavage volontaire," *Historia* 30 (1981), pp. 472-97. They discuss this passage at p. 497, and (rightly) take it perfectly seriously.

57.8 vasus fictilis: for the use of *vas* or *vasculum* to mean "testicle," see J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London 1982), pp. 42-43. He points out that "the formulaic phrase *lorum in aqua* is used in reference to impotence at Petron. 134. 9 (cf. Mart. 7. 58. 3f., 10. 55. 5), and the speaker may have identified the referent (*pars pro toto*) with a *mentula languida* after inadvertently making an identification with a *mentula rigida* in *vasus fictilis*." This is highly implausible. Perhaps the idea is that Ascyrtos is a *matella* (see above on 27. 3 and 45. 8): cf. Mart. XIV. 119 *Matella fictilis*. This would be an appropriate insult for a man taken to be a pathic, and would go well with the second insult *lorus in aqua*.

58.4 terrae tuber: there must surely be a play on *terrae filius*.

58.8 patrem tuum: this is odd, as addressed to a boy taken to be a slave. Is it a lapse of memory on the part of Petronius?

58.8 exi: the answer to each riddle is quite simply the penis.

58.10 anulos buxeos: some editors assume that Hermeros is addressing Ascyrtos, whereas he is actually addressing Giton. Hence this passage is irrelevant for the interpretation of 57. 4, and there is no need to assume that this is "a gold ring" (Smith), which is hardly the meaning of *anulos buxeos*. (Friedlaender, on 57. 4, commented: "als solchen [i.e. *eques Romanus*] erkennt er ihn an den goldnen Ringen, die er 58 verächtlich *anulos buxeos* nennt.") Exactly what is the significance of the box-wood rings is less easy to say.

63.2 asinus in tegulis: in 1920 "Le Boeuf sur le Toit" was used as the title of a ballet by Darius Milhaud, who claimed to have taken it from a Brazilian song. Presumably both it and the Latin phrase are intended to suggest something altogether unexpected and alarming. W. Ehlers (in the Tusculum edition, Munich 1965) compares the saying "Elefant im Porzellanladen" (our "bull in a china shop"), but the alarm would be all the greater if the creature were on the roof over one's head.

64.1 credimus: is this to be taken literally, so revealing Encolpius' credulity (after all, he could mistake a painted dog for a real one), or is he being sarcastic?

64.3 quadrigae: Plocamus' metaphor has a distinguished ancestry, going back to Ennius' description of himself as a retired racehorse (fr. 374-75 V). Compare Juv. 1. 20 (of Lucilius). Could *podagricus* also be a reminiscence of Ennius (*numquam poetor nisi si podager*—fr. 64 V)?

64.9 Margaritam: this was the name of a Roman dog whose tombstone is in the British Museum (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* VI. 19896 = *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* 1175). For the comparison of a dog with jewels (pearls?), cf. Mart. I. 109. 4 *Issa est carior Indicis lapillis*.

64.13 sedebant: this is a joke (as also at 68. 4), since slaves usually stood at their masters' feet (cf. e.g. 58. 1 *Giton, qui ad pedes stabat*). The eccentricity makes it unlikely to be an interpolation, *pace* J. P. Sullivan, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 22 (1976), p. 100. See also J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*² (Leipzig 1886), pp. 148, 175, with A. Mau's comments (which Friedlaender misunderstood). It hardly needs to be added that for slaves to recline along with the guests, as at 70. 10 ff., was normally unthinkable.

65.10 mortuum: is this to be taken literally, as a joke?

66.5 bene me admonet: this remark follows directly from the previous one—i.e. Scintilla is jealous of the *vernula*.

68.8 recutitus est et stertit: the joke is, of course, how does Habinnas know? He would have regarded the first point as a disadvantage, since the Romans considered circumcision disfiguring (cf. e.g. Celsus VII. 25. 1). (This had some effect on their attitude towards Jews.)

68.8 trecentis denariis (= 1200 sesterces): the point (as Smith suggests) is that Habinnas is proud of having acquired such a treasure for so reasonable a price. So A. H. M. Jones, *Economic History Review*, 2nd series 9 (1956), p. 193: "Petronius speaks of 300 denarii as a bargain price for a sharp-witted Jewish boy." For comparable prices, see R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1974), p. 349. The price of 100,000 sesterces, mentioned by Martial at I. 58. 1 and XI. 70. 1, and quoted by Smith, is intended to be exceptionally high (in the second passage it is described as *luxuria*).

70.13 sponsione: the humor is increased by the fact that the cook, as a slave, could not (strictly speaking) possess any money.

71.2 insulam: the word here means "apartment-house," not "block of apartment-houses." See *TLL* VII. 1. 2038. 53 ff.

71.8 praeponam . . . unum ex libertis: cf. *Inscript. Lat. Select.* 8342 *curatores substitutam.*

71.9 naves: Friedlaender compared the tomb of C. Munatius Faustus at Pompeii, on one side of which is a (symbolic?) relief showing a ship lowering its sails (E. la Rocca and others, *Guida archeologica di Pompei* [Verona 1976], p. 334). To this and his other examples may be added some from Ostia: see R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*² (Oxford 1973), plates 26b; 28a; 34a.

71.9 anulis aureis: these surely cannot be real gold rings, which, if put on tomb-statues, would be stolen. Gilding seems more probable.

71.10 triclinia: Friedlaender aptly cited *CIL* XIV. 375, one of the Ostian inscriptions to a P. Lucilius Gamala, where l. 17 should read *epulum trichilinis CCXVII colonis dedit.*

71.10 sibi suaviter facientem: usually taken to mean "having a good time," or (*OLD*) "enjoying themselves." The phrase has, however, an erotic sense (more like the time-honored salutation "Want a good time, dearie?"). Compare a graffito found on the painted plasterwork of a tomb at Catania, which reads, according to A. Sogliano (quoted by P. Orsi, *Notizie degli Scavi* [1918], pp. 59-60), XVII K SEPTEMBR FERIDIUS CERERIS DOMINAE S(ervus) HIC SIBI SVABITER FEC(it) E(o)RVM TRES ADVLESCENTES QVORVM NOMINA LEGE ONESIMVS ET L. VALERIVS CASIANVS ET FILVMENVS VNVS CVM MVLIERAE EA TAVRVS MVLTI ANNIS HABE FACIANT CONIVXIMVS. (See also *L'Année Épigraphique* [1919], no. 57.) Sogliano explains that Feridius, a slave in a temple of Ceres, abused three young men, two of them slaves and one free, and that another man called Taurus lay with a woman. It seems possible, however, that the writer intended SVABITER FECERVNT (the line breaks after FECE), although there appears from Orsi's photograph to be no doubt about the M. Perhaps the first line gives the writer's identity, and is syntactically separate from the rest. This reading would imply a more cooperative effort by the cast, and go better with CONIVXIMVS. Sogliano compared also *CIL* IV. 3442 *facitis vobis suaviter ego canto* (on a painting—illustrated in J. Ward-Perkins and A. Claridge, *Pompeii AD 79* [London 1976], no. 260—which shows a banquet with one man on his own and two couples embracing). So Trimalchio wants the people to be shown, not just enjoying themselves, but enjoying each other.

71.11 et unam licet fractam: Buecheler printed *urnam*, a conjecture drawn from Jacob Gronovius' MS annotations. The idea of a boy

weeping over a broken urn has struck several commentators as appropriately symbolic, but it is in fact both inaccurate and anachronistic. Both weeping children and (intact) urns appear on Greek grave-reliefs, though apparently not together. The concept seems a neoclassical one, although the urn so often wept over on neoclassical monuments is naturally intact, since it is supposed to contain the ashes of the deceased. The Alexandrian lamp showing an Eros mourning over a broken vase, cited by W. C. McDermott (*Classical Weekly* 37 [1943-44], pp. 170-71), is best ignored. Incidentally, it seems unlikely that Gronovius had in mind the symbolism envisaged by later commentators. It may furthermore be emphasized that, however inclined towards morbid sentimentality Trimalchio may be, it is not reflected in his tomb. The slave is surely weeping because he has spilt good wine. (The line of Propertius cited by Smith [IV. 5. 75 *sit tumulus lenae curto vetus amphora collo*] is—as he suggests—irrelevant: it refers to the use of broken-off necks of amphorae over paupers' graves, to serve as funnels for libations [as at Isola Sacra: Meiggs, pp. 463-64].)

71.11 horologium: the idea can be paralleled from an actual inscription, *CIL* VI. 10237, on a tombstone from the Via Labicana: *T(iti) Coccei Gaa et Patiens quaest(ores tertium) mensam quadratam in trichil(a), abacum cum basi, horologium, labrum cum fulmentis marmor(eis), putiale, crustas supra parietem itineris medi cum tegulis, columellam sub horologia Tiburtina, protectum ante porticum, trutinam et pondera d(e) d(ecurionum) s(ententia) posuerunt* A poem explains that the point of all this expense is *ne deserta vacent ignotis devia busta*. A similar idea must have inspired the erection of the tomb with a handsome and comfortable seat outside the Porta Marina at Ostia (*Scavi di Ostia: III, Le Necropoli* [Roma 1955], pl. 33).

73.2 balneum intravimus: it seems worth asking whether the text of this *locus vexatus* is really so corrupt. Trimalchio has apparently bought up a next-door bakery and converted it into a bath. The building might well have been the usual type of Roman shop, on a long narrow plot, and perhaps with a barrel vault. In other words, it would have looked like a typical barrel-vaulted reservoir, and might well have resonated when Trimalchio sang. (There is no reason to assume, as Smith does, that the reference is to the "main . . . reservoir": the Romans had plenty of small cisterns as well as big ones.) The epithet *frigidariae* is perhaps explicable by contrast with the hot water which the bath actually contains.

Some argue that one would expect Trimalchio to have a huge

bath, but in fact it was a remarkable extravagance for a private citizen to have a bath-house at all, especially at his town house. Even Trimalchio also uses the public baths (27-28: J. P. Sullivan, *Classical Quarterly* 20 [1970], p. 189, is mistaken in saying, on 73. 2, "the heroes have been in this *balneum* before [28. 1]").

73.5 solium: presumably this is the same bath in which Trimalchio first stood, then sat, and round whose *labrum* (§4) the other guests were running.

75.4 arcisellium: whatever this may be, it surely cannot be, as some suppose, a litter, for how could the boy possibly own this ultimate status symbol (see Juv. 3. 239 ff. with J. E. B. Mayor's notes)?

75.10 celerius barbatum: the reason why the boy wanted his beard to grow was that the celebration of his *barbatoria* (73. 6), and cutting off of his long hair, if he was a *puer capillatus*, were signs of adulthood, when he might cease to be his master's plaything, and turn to active sex himself. Cf. Mart. XII. 18. 24-25 *dispensat pueris rogatque longos levis ponere vilicus capillos*. See also my note on Mart. I. 31.

76.4 hoc iussisse: surely not, as J. Delz (*Gnomon* 34 [1962], p. 683) finds, at all incomprehensible. Trimalchio means that what happened was so remarkable that you might well think that, so far from being the last thing he could have wanted, it was just what he had ordered. Cf. *factum, non fabula*.

77.4 cenationem: Smith objects that this is "neither grandiose nor eccentric," but upstairs dining-rooms cannot have been common. In grand houses special ones might be built for summer use, for the coolness (in hot countries people like to dine on the tops of their houses). Vitruvius (VI. 4. 1-2) speaks of four dining-rooms, one for each season. Saloni's *lavationem* is absurd. If *cellationem* could mean "a row of rooms" (as Heinsius claimed) it might be right: a rich man might conceivably boast that his *domus* had spare bedrooms upstairs. But the word occurs nowhere else in Latin.

77.5 Scaurus: Maiuri's suggestion that this is intended for A. Umbricius Scaurus is attractive. His status is indicated by the fact that the *decuriones* voted that an equestrian statue of him should be set up in the forum at Pompeii.

78.6 libitinarii: presumably Iulius Proculus (38. 15-16), even though he seems by now to have given up his profession.

5

The Addressee of *Laus Pisonis*

M. D. REEVE

"A panegyric (261 hexameters) on a certain Calpurnius Piso, perhaps the conspirator (Tac. *Ann.* 15. 48) or the consul of A.D. 57." So *Laus Pisonis* is described, not for the first time, in a recent handbook.¹ Anonymous works provoke fantasy, and excesses of fantasy may provoke in other scholars an excess of caution.

The most recent commentators on the poem say that "with certainty" or "with the greatest probability" the addressee may be identified with the conspirator C. Calpurnius Piso and the Piso Calpurnius of a scholion on Juvenal 5. 109, himself identifiable thanks to Suetonius (*Gaius* 25. 1), Dio (59. 8. 7-8), and Tacitus (*Ann.* 15. 48, 65), with the conspirator.² Nowhere, indeed, do any of these sources conflict, and all of them except the poem plainly concern the conspirator. Neither Suetonius nor Dio, however, has anything relevant to the poem; the poem and Tacitus agree only on attributes not seldom accorded to members of the Roman aristocracy; and the poem and the scholion agree only on one attribute unlikely to have been possessed by more than one Calpurnius Piso, brilliance at *latrunculi*. The identification therefore turns on the authority of the scholion.

It appears in the edition of Juvenal published at Venice in 1486 by Georgius Valla, who ascribes the information, or at least the first part of it, to one Probus. This Probus sometimes furnishes precious

¹ *Cambridge history of classical literature II: Latin literature* (Cambridge 1982), p. 886; cf. J. W. and A. M. Duff, *Minor Latin poets* (London—Cambridge, Mass. 1934), p. 289.

² Gladys Martin, *Laus Pisonis* (diss., Cornell 1917), pp. 15-19; A. Seel, *Laus Pisonis: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (diss., Erlangen 1969), pp. 118-20.

material absent from the other scholia on Juvenal, for instance the quotation on 4. 94 from Statius' *Bellum Germanicum*; and it is now clear that his commentary, which as it came into Valla's hands was "mirae brevitatis" and gave out at 8. 198, had been used in much the same state by two readers of Juvenal at Brescia 500 years before.³ In general, therefore, Valla's Probus deserves quite as much respect as the other scholia, the fullest of which occur in manuscripts only another 150 years older. In particular passages, however, it is not always easy to distinguish Probus from Valla, and Valla has also been suspected of filling out Probus' brief notes with information drawn from other sources available to him, which in 1486 would have included most of the Latin literature known today. Consequently one reads such statements as these:⁴

Schol. Vallae ad Iuvenal. 5, 109 digna vix sunt quae adhibeantur, nam maximam partem ex Tacito prompta neque 'Probi' sed ipsius Vallae esse viri docti suspicati sunt, cf. Wessner in ed. (1931) p. 253 et XX-XXIII.

In the latter place Wessner expounds "Vallae morem rationemque amplificandi et interpolandi"; in the former he rightly says that Valla took from Tacitus the account of Seneca's last moments given in the scholion on 5. 109. No one, however, has shown how Valla could have compiled from Tacitus or other sources the accompanying scholion on Piso.

As Valla prints it, the scholion is corrupt in four places, but only superficially.⁵ Wessner's text may be rendered as follows:

Calpurnius Piso, as Probus says, came of an old family. He took tragic parts on the stage and was so accomplished and clever at the game of *latrunculi* that crowds flocked to watch him play. As a result he ingratiated himself with the emperor Gaius, who suddenly banished him on suspicion of resuming relations with the wife Gaius took from him and then returned. In due course under Claudius he came back,

³ See most recently Gius. Billanovich, *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 22 (1979), pp. 367-95, especially pp. 373-76, 390-95; for bibliography, p. 392, note 4. Incidentally, it seems likely to me that 6. 614abc owe their circulation to Probus' commentary: the early manuscripts that present them belong to northern Italy, and their disagreement over where to put them betrays incorporation from the margin. I also doubt whether Probus assigned them to Juvenal or was even citing earlier scholars who did. On the text and meaning of the lines see G. Luck, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76 (1972), pp. 229-30.

⁴ *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* C 284 (Groag) on C. Calpurnius Piso.

⁵ If the scholion is "maximam partem ipsius Vallae," how are these corruptions to be accounted for? They do not look like misprints.

and after holding the consulship and inheriting wealth from his mother he lived in great splendor and made a practice not only of supporting impecunious and deserving senators and knights but also of bestowing equestrian capital and rank on a number of men from the lower classes every year.

To begin with the *latrunculi*, we have seen that they occur elsewhere only in *Laus Pisonis*. Scholars who suppose that Valla took them from there⁶ cannot have looked at the transmission of the poem. The complete text first appears in an edition of Ovid published at Basel in 1527 by Johannes Sichardus, who had found a manuscript at Lorsch. Otherwise the only witness is the *Florilegium Gallicum*, compiled in central France about the middle of the 12th century.⁷ Its compiler evidently admired the poem; at any rate, he excerpted from it almost 200 of its 261 lines, an unusually high proportion.⁸ The longest passage he omitted consists of 19 lines, but it so happens that it is the poet's description of Piso's performance at *latrunculi*, which must have been even less intelligible in 12th-century France than it is now. That from northern Italy Valla's arm was long enough to reach Lorsch is neither attested nor plausible; and had he found the text either there or anywhere else, he would surely have printed it.⁹ Furthermore, the poem does not say that through acting and *latrunculi* Piso ingratiated himself with Gaius; neither the poem nor any other literary source says that he returned from exile under Claudius¹⁰ and after holding the consulship inherited wealth from his mother; and the scholion gives a more precise account of his beneficence.¹¹ Rather than believe that Valla either made these things up or imported them

⁶ Seel, p. 119, note 2; G. B. Townend, *Classical Quarterly* 66 (1972), p. 378.

⁷ On this anthology see R. H. Rouse, *Viator* 10 (1979), pp. 135-38.

⁸ J. Hamacher, *Florilegium Gallicum: Prolegomena und Edition der Exzerpte von Petronius Cicero, De oratore* (Bern und Frankfurt 1975), pp. 146-56, gives the compiler's text. Some modern readers too express guarded approval of the poem; cf. Schanz-Hosius II, p. 489, Vollmer in *Real-Encyclopädie* under *Laus Pisonis*. I hereby join them. It is a fluent, orderly, and sober poem in a thankless and inebriating genre, and maintains interest with little recourse to padding. The *Cambridge history*, pp. 628-29, makes fun of it.

⁹ Besides using Probus for the first time, he printed the first edition of Avienius. Cf. Billanovich, p. 394.

¹⁰ An inscription, *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* VI. 2032. 13, records his presence among the *fratres Arvales* at an unknown date under Claudius.

¹¹ For these reasons E. Matthias, "De scholiis in Iuvenalem," *Diss. Philol. Halenses* II (Halle 1876), pp. 279-81, derived the scholion from a source independent of Tacitus, Dio, and Suetonius. He did not mention *Laus Pisonis* or the problem of distinguishing between Probus and Valla.

from lost sources, it is much simpler to accept that the words *ut Probus inquit* cover the whole scholion and are true.

There is another reason for ruling out lost sources. The prose of the scholion exhibits clausulae throughout, whether quantitative or accentual:¹²

Piso Calpurnius (ut Probus inquit), antiqua familia, scaenico habitu tragoedias āctitāvīt, in latrunculorum lusu tam perfectūs ēt cāllidūs ut ad eum ludentem concūrrērētūr. Ob haec insinuatus C. Caesari repente etiām rēlēgātūs ēst quod consuetudinem pristināe ūxorīs abductae sibi ab ipso, deinde remissae, repetivisse existimābātūr. Mox sub Claudio rēstitūtūs et post consulatum materna hereditātē dītātūs magnificētissimē vīxīt, meritos sublevare inopes ex utroque ordine solitus, de plebe vero certos quotquot annis ad equestrem censum dignitatēmpquē prōvēhērē.

A glance at Valla's preface suffices to show that he was not following either the quantitative or the accentual system, and he could hardly have strung together so many clausulae by accident. Moreover, other scholia on historical figures, and not scholia peculiar to Valla, exhibit clausulae:¹³

Sarmentus, nationē Tūscūs, e domo Marci Favoni incertum libērtūs ān sērvūs, plurimis forma et urbanitātē prōmēritīs eo fidūciā vēnīt ut pro equite Romano ageret, decuriam quoque quaestoriam cōmpārārēt; quare per ludos, quia in primis XIII ordinibus sedit, haec a populo in eum dicta sunt . . . Dum autem causam usurpatae dignitatis dicit, precibus et gratia summoto accusatōrē dīmīssūs ēst, cum apud iudices nihil aliud docērē tēptārēt quam concessam sibi libertatem a Maecenate, ad quem sectio bonorum Favoni pērtinūērāt. Iam autem senex in maximis necessitatibus, ad quas libidine luxuriēquē dēcīdērāt, coactus āuctiōnārī cum interrogaretur cur scriptum quoque cēnsōriū vēdērēt, non infacete bonae se memoriae ēssē rēspōndīt . . . (5. 3)

¹² The two systems notoriously overlap. I have scanned by quantity, but everything I have marked fits the other system, and *ordine solitus* fits it better. At the meeting of the American Philological Association in December 1982 Ralph Hall and Steven Oberhelman described their work on clausulae in a wide range of imperial prose; some of their results will shortly be published in *Classical Philology*.

¹³ I choose a long example for the obvious reason, an example from satires 7-16 to show that the clausulae cannot be attributed to Townend's hypothetical commentator on 1-6, about whom more below. For other examples, not all equally clear, see the *Vita* printed by Wessner (where in line 18 read in *extrema Aegypti parte tendentis*, "quartered at the other end of Egypt"), 1.109 Valla, 155, 2.29, 4.53, 77, 6.620 = 628, 638, 7.199, 10.126, 11.91, 12.47. For long notes certainly not clausulated see e.g. 8.254, 10.274, 276, 15.173.

Mithridates cum per quadraginta annos adversus Romanos dīmīcāsset, cum Pharnacem filium suum post ceteros eius fratres voluissēt occīdērē, ab omni relictu^s ēxercitū^s est et exhausto veneno periit, accepto frequēter āntīdōtō ut perīrē nōn pōssēt. Postea vero Pharnaces successit eūs īmpēriō . . . (10. 273)

The use of clausulae in works as humble as commentaries has not been investigated,¹⁴ and most commentaries have come down in so distorted a form that the occurrence of clausulae in some places will rarely allow conclusions of any importance to be drawn from their absence in others.¹⁵ Occasionally, however, it may be helpful to know that someone composed a scholion in a particular form, and that is true of the scholion quoted by Valla on Juvenal 5. 109.

If any conflation of Calpurnii took place, therefore, it took place in Antiquity, not in 1486. Did it take place? The scholia on 4. 81 confuse Vibius Crispus with Passienus Crispus,¹⁶ but names are more often greeted with silence or total incomprehension than with confused erudition, and on satires 1-6 respectable sources, consulted perhaps by someone almost contemporary with Juvenal, appear to underlie many of the scholia.¹⁷ Be that as it may, Probus' statements on 5. 109 show no sign of conflation, and nothing suggests that he lifted the *latrunculi* from a poem about another Piso.

In short, it requires either an unhealthy appetite for coincidence or an indiscriminating mistrust of scholiasts to believe that *Laus Pisonis* was addressed to anyone other than the conspirator C. Calpurnius Piso.¹⁸

University of Toronto

¹⁴ A. Klotz, *Archiv für lat. Lexikographie* 15 (1908), pp. 504-08, detected quantitative clausulae in Lactantius Placidus' commentary on the *Thebaid*. In *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford 1983), p. 395, note 14, I voiced a vague feeling about Donatus' commentary on Terence. Has anyone gone looking in Servius?

¹⁵ To take a trivial example from the scholion on 5. 3 (just quoted in the text), someone may object that a writer who ends a clause *dignitatis dicit* cannot have been using either quantitative or accentual clausulae; but transposition of *dicit* after *causam* will create a quantitative clausula, and we are lucky when scholia have suffered nothing worse in transmission than the misplacing of one word.

¹⁶ On this confusion see the *Appendix* below.

¹⁷ G. B. Townend, *Classical Quarterly* 66 (1972), pp. 376-87, an important and stimulating article.

¹⁸ The substance of this article formed part of a paper delivered in February 1983 at Urbana. Its submission to *JCS* is small return for the hospitality of Kevin Newman and his colleagues.

APPENDIX

Lipsius established in the second edition of his commentary on Tacitus (Antwerp 1589), pp. 128-29 on *Ann.* 12. 6, that the scholia on Juvenal 4. 81 confuse Vibius Crispus of Vercellae (*Tac. Dial.* 8. 1), present at Domitian's conclave, with Passienus Crispus of unknown origin, husband and allegedly victim of Agrippina. The confusion takes different forms, however, in PS and in Valla.

Emended in places irrelevant to the confusion, the scholion in PS reads as follows:

Municeps Vercellensis. Tirocinio suo in senatu ita coepit 'patres conscripti et tu, Caesar', propter quod simulata oratione plenissime a Tiberio conlaudatus. Plurimas sponte causas apud centumviros egit, pro qua re in basilica Iulia eius statua posita est. Consulatus duos gessit. Uxores habuit duas, primam Domitiam, deinde Agrippinam, illam amitam, hanc matrem Neronis Caesaris. Possedit bis milies sestertia. Omnium principum gratiam adpetivit sed praecipue C. Caesaris, quem iter facientem secutus est pedibus; hic nullo audiente ab eodem interrogatus haberetne sicut ipse cum sorore germana consuetudinem 'nondum' inquit quantumvis decenter et caute, ne aut negans eum argueret aut adsentiens semet mendacio dehonestaret. Periiit per fraudem Agrippinae, quam heredem reliquerat, et funere publico elatus est.

Vercellensis *Pithoeus*: visellens est PS

C. *add. Lipsius*

pedibus PS: per Alpes *Wessner ex Valla*

ab eodem *Wessner*: a Nerone PS

Everything here except presumably *municeps Vercellensis*, if that is the right reading, refers to Passienus Crispus, and the information came from Suetonius (= fr. 88 Reifferscheid). Other scholia, those in *Wessner's* $\phi\chi$, give only the story about the emperor's question and Crispus' reply; they make Tiberius the emperor, doubtless because he was named earlier in the fuller form of the note.

Valla ends with the same story, told of Tiberius, but begins as follows:

Vibius Crispus Placentinus (ut inquit Probus, nec me praeterit quid Tacitus scribat), et manu prōmptūs ēt līnguā, sub Claudio et consulātum adēptūs ita modestia studium orandi tēmpērāvīt ut amorem in se principum prōvōcārēt. Idem postremo amissis plūrīmīs filiīs ab uxore speciosa, quam formae grātiā dūxērāt, veneno necatus est.

Wessner and others declare that *ut inquit Probus* is a lie and Valla assigned Vibius Crispus to Placentia because he came from Placentia

himself. That is surely incredible. What did he or Placentia stand to gain? He may on the other hand have interpolated *Vibius* from *Dial.* 8. 1, a defensible procedure; but if so, who was Crispus Placentinus? Passienus Crispus, for all we know, came from Placentia, but not everything said about Crispus Placentinus fits what the scholion in PS says about Passienus Crispus: many reasons might have led Passienus Crispus to marry Agrippina, but surely not her appearance, nor would she have entered someone else's biography as an anonymous beauty. Moreover, the unadorned consulship suits neither Passienus (*cos. II a. 44*) nor Vibius (*cos. ter*). There is also a textual difficulty, underlined by the clausulae but present anyway: *sub Claudio et* must be corrupt, and either *et* is intrusive (or corrupt) or something has fallen out before it. If something has fallen out, the note could refer to Vibius Crispus, though *Placentinus* would then, it seems, be a mistake (see the epigraphic evidence cited by *PIR* V. 379). Whichever Crispus it refers to, the conflict with the scholion in PS seems to demand either an *aliter* or an *alius fuit Crispus* in some earlier form of the commentary.

I can go no further, but I am not yet convinced that Valla's Probus, let alone the original commentary, confused one Crispus with another.

6

Pietatis Ergo

A LETTER FROM A. S. PEASE TO CYRIL BAILEY

The following communication and transcription of a letter from A. S. Pease to Cyril Bailey was sent to the Editor by Professor Arthur J. Pomeroy of the Department of Classics, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, and is here reprinted with Professor Pomeroy's permission.

Pease was Professor of the Classics at Urbana from 1909-1924,* and from 1911 Curator of what was then known as the Museum of Classical Art and Archaeology. Subsequently he was President of Amherst College, Massachusetts, in which capacity he put through some needed reforms and was noted for his insistence that the aim of undergraduate education is to enable students to think for themselves. He abruptly resigned his position in 1932 to take up the Pope Professorship of Latin Language and Literature at Harvard, a chair he held until his retirement in 1950. He was President of the American Philological Association in 1939-40. He died in 1964.

A keen mountaineer, Pease was distinguished as botanist as well as classical scholar. Five plants bear his name. His *A Flora of Northern New Hampshire*, originally published in 1924, was reissued in 1964. In 1963 with a colleague he published *Generic Names of Orchids*. His youthful (1903) *List of Plants on Three Mile Island* has, in view of events of our day, a poignancy worthy of *A Shropshire Lad*.

His classical interests embraced the work of St. Jerome, on whom he published a number of papers, and collaboration with Urbana colleagues on a Concordance to the plays of Seneca. His edition of *Aeneid* IV appeared in 1935, and was followed in 1955 by Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*. The edition of the *De Divinatione* so mishandled

by Bailey was reprinted in Germany in 1963. His courtesy breathes from every line of his brief answer to his Oxford critic. *Ave, pia animal!*

Professor Pomeroy writes:

I recently discovered in the Victoria University of Wellington library some material relating to A. S. Pease which may be of interest to your Department.

The library possesses Pease's edition of the *De Divinatione* (Urbana, Illinois: Book One, 1920 [1921] and Book Two, 1923), purchased second-hand from Blackwell's in 1959. Inside Volume 1, between pages 64 and 65, are bound the corrected proofs from Cyril Bailey's review (*Classical Review* 37 [1923], pp. 30-31). This is clearly his review copy, dated Harlech 9/8/22 at the end of the volume. It has some marginal scorings and a comment to the note on I. xxxix. 84 *dirimat tempus*, "What does it mean?", indicative of what Bailey found interesting and also his frustration with the apparent lack of clear direction given by Pease's notes, as he complains in the review.

Volume Two has greater interest because between pages 574 and 575 are bound a handwritten letter from Pease, written after he had seen Bailey's review of Volume One, and Bailey's corrected proofs for the review of the second volume (*Classical Review* 41 [1927], p. 151). Attached is a transcription of Pease's letter.

I rather feel that Pease offered his comment on the Lucretius article as an excuse to defend his particular type of exacting scholarship against Bailey's criticisms. The comments had their effect. In his review of Volume Two, Bailey says that he may have been too rash in assuming that the book was intended for the use of ordinary, rather than more advanced students. But his "grumbling" at the lack of guidance offered in difficult passages and the large number of bracketed references is unabated.

Despite Bailey's recognition of the importance of Pease's work and the appreciation expressed from Pease's side, it is apparent that, irrespective of their common interests, the two hardly knew one another. Perhaps the distance was too great—more likely, I think, an indifference to American scholarship by the English which persists to this day explains the lack of contact and the tone of this exchange.

The text of Pease's letter is as follows:

1114 West Oregon Street,
Urbana, Illinois,
15 March, 1923.

Professor Cyril Bailey

My dear Sir:-

May I express to you the interest which I have just felt reading your article on the Religion of Lucretius?* It has occurred to me that you would perhaps be interested in knowing of an article dealing with the question in a somewhat similar way by Professor G. D. Hadzits in the *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* 39 (1908), 73-88, entitled: *Significance of Worship and Prayer among the Epicureans*.

In connection with Lucretius' allusion (5,8) to Epicurus as 'deus' (p. 20 of your article) one might compare Cic. *N. D.* 1,43, where Velleius says: *Ea qui consideret quam inconsulte ac temere dicantur venerari Epicurum et in eorum ipsorum numero de quibus haec quaestio est (sc. deorum) habere debeat*.

I am also naturally interested in your notice in the *Classical Review* of the first part of my edition of the *De Divinatione*. In one respect, perhaps, you did not fully understand the purpose of the edition, which was not to be a textbook for more elementary students (for, in America, at least, the book is rarely read in college courses) but rather a book of reference for the more advanced who might desire help in the investigation of particular points in religion, philosophy, folk-lore, history, etc. in which this book is so rich. Had it been for the former class the notes would have been less extensive and more dogmatic. Nor was it my intention to write an encyclopaedia of divination in general, like the excellent work of Bouché-Leclercq, but rather to furnish bibliographical and other suggestions which might be of help to those who desire to pursue individual points more in detail. With this in view I have often deliberately avoided appearing to prejudice a case by the expression of my own choice between conflicting views, thinking the decision a matter safely left to the reader.

It may well be that I have been mistaken in my idea of what would be useful in the case of this work, the appeal of which is rather from the side of learning than from that of pure literature; you and one or two other reviewers clearly feel so (though the majority have not so judged). It is too late, however, to change the plan of the

* C. Bailey, "Religion in Lucretius," *Proceedings of the Classical Association* (1922), pp. 9-25.

commentary on the second book (now in press), even were such a change not inconsistent and out of scale with the plan of the first book, but perhaps these explanations which I have given may serve to abate *a little* the "grumblings" which you express in your notes.

The lack of footnotes in the notes necessitated the use of parentheses for documentation which may at times be a little confusing; if there is also confusion in the arrangement of the *subject matter* of the notes I feel very regretful for it, since I strove to make the notes advance from beginning to end in a logical development, using, so far as possible, the words of the ancients themselves rather than my own paraphrases of them. This makes the notes slower reading, but more reliable for the scholar.

Very sincerely yours,

Arthur Stanley Pease.

Notes on Pseudo-Quintilian's Minor Declamations*

W. S. WATT

The following editions are referred to: P. Aerodius (Paris 1563); J. F. Gronovius (Leiden 1665); U. Obrecht (Strasbourg 1698); P. Burman (Leiden 1720, with notes of Schulting and others); C. Ritter (Leipzig 1884, with contributions by E. Rohde).

Other scholars referred to are:

Morawski (C. v.), *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 5 (1885), cols. 1099-1103.

Opitz (R.) in *Commentationes philol. Ribbeck* (Leipzig 1888), pp. 43-55.

Leo (F.), *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (1912) = *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. E. Fraenkel, ii (Rome 1960), pp. 249-62.

Hagendahl (H.) in *Apophoreta Lundström* (Göteborg 1936), pp. 325-27.

All page-and-line references are to Ritter's text.

4. 16: quare si hanc tantum negasset aliquando et postea obtulisset non tamen poterat videri quadruplo obligatus, cum hoc ipsum quadruplum cum ea summa *habuerit* quae nega<ba>tur.

The law states that a man who dishonestly denies having received a deposit shall be liable to four-fold restitution.

"If he had at one time denied the original sum (*hanc*) only, and later offered it, he still could not have been regarded as liable for

* I am most grateful to Dr. M. Winterbottom for detailed and helpful comments on these notes.

the four-fold amount since [or 'although'] he *habuerit* this very four-fold amount together with the sum which was denied." Since *habuerit* yields no sense, Ritter adopts Rohde's tentative suggestion *abnuerit*: "since he denied liability for" etc. This is unsatisfactory for two reasons: (a) the mere fact that he denied liability for the four-fold amount in no way means that he was *not* liable; (b) this view ignores *et postea obtulisset*. More probably, I suggest, we should read *debuerit*: "although he owed this very four-fold amount together with the sum which was denied," but later ceased to owe it when he offered to return the deposit.

6. 1: itaque et alias quoque condiciones frugalitati tuae ponit amicus paternus: si vixeris quomodo videris fecisse, si tenendi potius patrimonii quam auferendi habueris curam, est adhuc quod tibi possit tribuere patrimonium paternum; sed adhuc *habet suum*.

A father with a dissipated son stipulated that, after his death, his estate should remain in the keeping of a friend until his son reformed his ways. When this seemed to have happened, the friend handed over part of the estate; the son is now suing the friend for four-fold restitution.

Ritter's text (given above) should be repunctuated by putting a full stop after *curam*, since *si vixeris* and *si habueris* are the two *condiciones* laid down by the friend of the father. A new sentence begins with *est adhuc*: "there is still something which could bestow upon you your father's estate," i.e. you can still get it (by fulfilling these conditions), but (in the meantime) "the friend still holds his own." *habet suum* was rightly queried by Schulting; the sense demands *habet <ut> suum*, "holds it as if it were his own"; for the expression cf. Cicero, *Fam.* I. 9. 21 "eius . . . opibus . . . sic fruor ut meis."

6. 20: verum me quamvis *praecipue* in hoc iudicium agat ultio †*tal*is† illud quidem periculum fallit: hodie constituētis an merito absolutus sim.

A stepmother had administered to a brave soldier a sleeping-draught which had prevented him from taking part in a battle; accused of desertion, he had been acquitted (*absolutus sim*), and now accuses his stepmother of "poisoning."

There seems no reason for Ritter's obelization of *illud quidem*; it can be retained if *ne* is inserted before *illud*, as Ritter himself suggested. For *tal*is he suggested *tamen*, but I think that an adjective agreeing with *ultio*, e.g. <*natu*>*ralis*, is more probable. Finally for

praecipue I should adopt Opitz's *praecipitem* (for *praecipitem agere* see TLL 1. 1371. 70 ff.), which heightens the contrast between the two clauses: "although I am driven headlong into this trial by my natural thirst for vengeance, I am not blind to this danger either, that today you will pronounce on the question of whether my acquittal [in the trial for desertion] was justified." The other danger to which he is not blind is that of losing the present case against his stepmother.

14. 28: non illum, quamvis semianimem atque palpitantem, invasit carnifex, non vulneratum cruentumque per ora populi traxit, non illud caput †vel exanimae legi† recisum est.

A young man, under the impression that the girl he had raped would opt for his death, prefers to commit suicide rather than be executed.

Ritter prints the passage as emended by Rohde: *non illi caput, vel examini, lege*. The change of *legi* to *lege* (so the vulgate) seems certain, and that of *illud* to *illi* is probable, but I have no idea what *vel examini* is supposed to mean. I suggest [*vel*] *ex immani lege*; I presume that *uel* or *ul* is a repetition of the last two letters of *caput*. The law which prescribes death for rape unless the victim opts to marry the guilty man might well be called *immanis*, and the corruption of that word in this context (especially so soon after *semianimem*) to some form of *exanimus* is understandable.

17. 22: videamus nunc quam rationem secuta sit lex constituendae eiusmodi poenae, quam me hercule videtur mihi potiore clementia quam iustitia constituisse. pro morte hominis innocentis, pro vita quinquennii denique constituit absentiam.

Despite the heroic clausula *constituisse*, it would seem that *pro morte* begins a new sentence. But then it is awkward to have both *pro morte* and *pro vita* in the same sentence and meaning the same thing; perhaps one of the two should be deleted.

21. 22: egi. puta enim eadem statim die qua reum detuli interrogari te, quid faciam? †an ante† cum album descripsi, cum iudices reieci, per illas omnes moras iudiciorum . . . quid aliud feci quam ut agerem?

The injured husband insists that he did start legal proceedings against his wife's paramour.

In the obelized passage Ritter, after Rohde, unconvincingly reads *agamne*, but in his apparatus he suggests *deinde*. Something like the

latter word is all that is required, introducing mention of the later stages of the legal action; but <t>um autem is closer to the paradosis.

34. 8: sed cur ego diutius circa causas maleficii istius †et morbit? confessus est.

The vulgate is *etiam moror*, and some form of this verb is certain; it is used with *circa* at 107. 25, 319. 25, and in the passages listed in *TLL* 8. 1500. 68-71. But to explain the corruption to *morbi* we should write not *moror* but *morabor*.

43. 14: dignum esse existimo qui maneat in civitate. pericula nostra tentavit; servitutem rei publicae discutere, quantum in ipso erat, voluit.

The man in question had laid information about a plot to establish a tyranny.

With Ritter's text (given above) I can make no sense of *tentavit*. Rohde's <sus>*tentavit* would be an exaggerated claim to make on behalf of someone who had merely laid information. Schulting's *denuntiavit* would fit the context but is too far from the paradosis. Moreover considerations of concinnity suggest that *tentavit* originally had an infinitive corresponding to the infinitive with *voluit*. In favor of <evitare> *tentavit* (a good clausula) one could adduce an earlier passage of this declamation (41. 22), "evitare quod praevidit periculum cupit," but there are obviously other possibilities.

44. 20: ergo dicet is qui legem feret non esse honestum recipere transfugas; nihil prodesse, forsitan * * * ad finem belli.

Two states are at war; in one of them a law is proposed forbidding the admission of deserters from the other.

To fill the lacuna Hagendahl (pp. 325 f.) proposes *nocere etiam*. His arguments prove beyond doubt that this is the sense required, but more natural with an *ad* construction would be *etiam obesse*. For the conjunction of the two verbs cf. Cicero, *Inv.* 1. 165 "multi nihil prodesse philosophiam, plerique etiam obesse arbitrantur"; *De orat.* 1. 154 "si isdem verbis uterer, nihil prodesse, si aliis, etiam obesse"; and many other passages listed in *TLL* 9. 2. 265. 35-72.

45. 5: nemo igitur dubitaverit turpissimos esse qui transfugerint; spectemus enim rem ipsam [*sc.* transfugium], neque eo decipiamur, quod utile videtur. hostis est qui facit [*i.e.* qui transfugit]; aliter constituamus *quam* ut intellegamus potuisse hoc et nostros facere.

For *quam* Ritter adopts Rohde's conjecture *inquam*, thereby making

aliter very difficult to understand and destroying the *aliter . . . quam* combination. I believe that the *paradosis* is sound apart from the fact that *non* should be inserted before *aliter*: "in making up our minds whether to accept the deserters from the enemy let us not fail to realize that our men also could have been guilty of desertion." The speaker goes on to argue that deserters should never under any circumstances be accepted.

The same remedy is called for at 198. 20, *gloria infelicibus erat, facere quod velles*, which gives the opposite of the sense required. Ritter adopts Gronovius' change of *velles* to *nolles* without mentioning Obrecht's insertion of *non* before *facere*, which in my view deserves the preference.

47. 7: num minus animi sine his, num minus pertinaciae desertis? age sane, hoc non cogitatis, quod . . . nec portas praeccludere nec publica retinere cura tanti putant? miratur aliquis timere me hostes quod isti transfugiunt? illi *me* non timent. caveamus, obsecro, dum plures sumus.

I have put a question-mark both after *putant* (for *age* introducing a question see *TLL* 1. 1404. 63 ff.) and after *transfugiunt*. "Is anyone surprised that I fear the enemy because these deserters form a fifth column in our city (46. 17 ff.)? The enemy do not fear me. Let us take precautions before we are outnumbered by the deserters." I see no point in the speaker saying that the enemy do not fear *him*; why should they fear him? He has just been saying that the enemy have no less courage or determination because of the desertions, and make no attempt to stop them; what we should now expect is "the enemy feel no fear (because of the desertions)." It would seem that, if *me* is not an erroneous repetition of the preceding *me*, it is the remnant of something like *me* <*hercule*> (which, according to Ritter's Index, occurs 21 times in these Declamations).

49. 22: filios vero quis dubitavit umquam esse plerumque suae potestatis? ut ea praeteream quae sub tam bono patre ne argumenti quidem causa referenda sunt, nec dicam "non coges templa incendere, non coges operibus publicis manus adferre," leviora certe nostrae mediocritatis esse manifestum est, ut sententiam iudices dicere * * * velimus, ut testimonium non ad arbitrium parentum reddere, *amico* suadere quod animus dictaverit.

There are many matters in which a son is not obliged to obey his father. This is obvious in the case of outrageous orders involving the burning of temples and damage to public buildings, but it is also

obvious that things of less importance than these are entirely within the competence of the sons themselves, like their vote when serving on a jury, their testimony in court, and the giving of honest advice to a friend.

Ritter, following Rohde, reads *dicere* <*liceat qualem*> *velimus*. I do not believe that *ut* here should introduce a clause with a subjunctive verb; I think it is equivalent to *velut*, "as for instance." In that case all that is missing between *dicere* and *velimus* is the relative *quam*.

amico is Opitz's convincing emendation (based on the parallel passage 422. 24) of the manuscript reading *immo*. Concinnity suggests, but perhaps does not demand, the insertion of *ut* before *amico*.

54. 3: hoc [*sc. parricidium*] profecto etiam in acie facere cogitasti et, cum imitareris virtutem meam, non optandi ius sed pugnandi quaerere videbaris. *ego*, quantum est in te, in medio foro et universa spectante civitate filii manu trucidatus sum *etc.*

This is one of the many passages in Latin authors where *ego* could with advantage be changed to *ergo*.

57. 24: quam istud non humani tantum operis sed divini cuiusdam beneficii arbitrandum est, cum hos coniunxistis copulastisque! Fortunae nihil necesse habeo diutius hoc imputare, tamquam non intellectum.

copulastisque Aerodius: culpastisque codd.

istud is a poor man's rescue of a rich man's daughter from a shipwreck.

1. Ritter punctuates with a question-mark after *arbitrandum est*, but whether one breaks the sentence there or later it is obvious that *quam* here introduces not a question but an exclamation (so Leo, p. 261, n. 3).
2. The *cum* clause follows naturally on what precedes. Nothing is gained by reading *tum* or *tunc*.
3. The plurals *coniunxistis* and *copulastisque* are unintelligible; they could only refer to the judges, and it was not the judges who joined together and coupled the poor man and the rich man's daughter (*hos*). Leo (loc. cit.) keeps the plurals by emending to *coniunxistis*, *di*, *ligastisque*; this is approved by Hagendahl (p. 327), but it has no palaeographical probability. Surely (as was realized by some of the older editors) it was Fortuna who joined the two together; so read *cum hos coniunxisti copulastique, Fortuna! nihil* etc. (The change of plurals to singulars is due to Obrecht.) Like Lucan,

the authors of these declamations are fond of apostrophizing Fortuna; see 108. 9, 196. 20; *Decl. mai.* p. 351. 1 Lehnert; also *TLL* 6. 1. 1191. 35-46. Here the apostrophe of the goddess explains the adjective *divini*.

60. 14: *recedere iubes a marito tali? qua tandem causa? "pauper est." non solebat hoc illi apud te nocere. †relinquam nec† dico pauperem; nam in matrimonio quidem filiae quod solebat† nocere, te auctore nupsit, te hortante nupsit.*

It would seem that the first of the two corrupt passages echoes the wording of the theme (55. 11), "*imperat [sc. pater filiae] ut relinquat pauperem.*" If so, this may well be another (indignant) question, *relinquat haec, dico, pauperem?*, repeating the preceding *recedere iubes a marito tali?*

In the second passage Ritter thinks that *nocere* is an erroneous repetition of the preceding *nocere*; he therefore replaces it with *sufficere*, but mentions in his apparatus two (unsatisfactory) ways of retaining *nocere* while making alterations elsewhere. Perhaps *quod solebat nocere* is not an erroneous repetition but an intentional echo of *non solebat . . . nocere*, and sense can be obtained by the simple expedient of inserting *non* before *nocere*: "what used to be helpful to a bridegroom in connection with a daughter's marriage, she married on her father's instigation and encouragement."

61. 12: *in plerisque controversiis plerumque hoc quaerere solemus, utrum ipsorum persona utamur ad dicendum an advocati, vel propter sexum (sicut <in> feminis) vel propter aliquam alioqui vitae vel ipsius de quo quaeritur facti deformitatem.*

alioqui is a very common word in these declamations (as in Quintilian's *Institutio*), and sometimes its exact sense is difficult to determine. In this passage it seems to have no sense at all, and is best deleted as a duplication of *aliquam* (cf. note on 128. 8 below). The codex Chigianus (C) reads *malitiam*, for which there is nothing to be said; if a noun were required, *maculam* would correspond nicely with *deformitatem*.

62. 3: *arroganter autem faciet et tumide si coeperit se ipsum laudare, praesertim iactaturus id quod facere possit a fortuna esse.*

It would be arrogant of the wealthy young man to boast in court of his generosity to other young men, "although (*praesertim*) he would be boasting of that which he could represent as being the result of

good fortune [not his own merit]." This is an instance of *praesertim* with concessive force, and there is no reason to suspect the text. For the contrast between wealth and merit cf. Cicero, *Fam.* II. 3. 1 (the giving of public games) "est copiarum, non virtutis."

64. 16: nec hic lege *possit* fieri reus si hanc ipsam pecuniam . . . per gulam ventremque transmitteret.

Read *posset*.

70. 8: si haec vis est legis istius, *ut sit de aequalitate patrimoniorum*, idem census omnibus detur, omnes paene dies, omnia tempora necesse erit in hac partitione consumi, si quis frugalius vixerit, si quis luxuriosius vixerit.

The terms of the proposed law are "ut patrimonia aequentur" (69. 24). It is therefore foolish to say "if the effect of this law is that it should concern the equality of estates"; and the expression is awkward. To inject some relevant sense into the *ut* clause Gronovius proposed *ut sit* <*semper*> *aequalitas patrimoniorum*, Ritter *ut sit de* <*perpetua*> *aequalitate patrimoniorum*, but the former is not easy palaeographically and in the latter the expression remains awkward. I suggest *ut sic* [*de aequalitate patrimoniorum*] *idem* etc., the three words in brackets having intruded from the margin; our oldest manuscript (A) has many marginal notes.

75. 31: quid remitti potest nisi quod †creditur? haec rogatio nihil aliud fuit quam ignominiosorum in pristinum statum restitutio.

The *rogatio* in question was one by which "ignominia remittebatur notatis" (74. 13).

For *creditur* Ritter (following Rohde) reads *debetur*, which makes satisfactory sense but palaeographically is hardly convincing. More probably *creditur* is sound, and *deberi* has dropped out either before it or after it; in order to forego payment you must *believe that* payment is owed to you.

92. 11: nihil est ergo quod ingenia iactent, nihil quod ex animo suo tantum *referant*: quaeritur quis omnibus prosit.

A father with three sons (a doctor, an orator, a philosopher) bequeathed his estate to the one who proved that he was more useful to the community than the other two. The doctor is here speaking about his rivals.

I can make no sense of *referant*. What we should expect is a verb

of the same sort of meaning as *iactent*, and with its own object. I suggest *se efferant*: "it's no good that they should praise themselves, in accordance merely with their own opinion."

92. 22: ergo et aequaliter ad omnes medicina sola pertinet et nulla tam necessaria est omni generi hominum quam medicina.

The omission of *ars* in the latter clause is surprising. Should it be inserted between *necessaria* and *est*?

95. 4: neque ego ignoro esse quosdam qui, quamquam nomen sapientiae facile atque avide, ut sic dixerim, dederunt, tamen *quidam* sapientem ex fabulis repetunt, et inter eos qui studuerunt, qui elaboraverunt, nullum adhuc inventum esse confitentur.

Leo (p. 255) sees in this sentence an imperfect conflation of two formulations: 1. "neque ego ignoro esse quosdam qui sapientem ex fabulis repetunt"; 2. "quamquam nomen sapientiae facile atque avide, ut sic dixerim, dederunt, tamen *quidam* sapientem ex fabulis repetunt." Leo says that the *quamquam* . . . *dederunt* clause "geht auf die Setzung des Namens überhaupt"; this shows that (like Burman and Ritter) he has failed to recognize the metaphorical sense of *nomen dare*: "although they have, if I may so express myself, enrolled under the banner of Wisdom" (*Sapientia* personified). Only if *nomen dare* has a metaphorical sense can the apology *ut sic dixerim* have any relevance.

Despite Leo, I think that Gronovius' *idem* for *quidam* may be all that is required to restore an intelligible sentence. For the opposite corruption cf. Cicero, *Fam.* IX. 6. 5, *quandam* corrupted to *eandem*.

96. 20: haec dixisse satis erat; nam, si civitati nihil utilitatis adferunt hi cum quibus contendit, *satis erat* relictum esse me solum.

It is clear that the second *satis erat* is, at least in part, an erroneous repetition of the first. Rohde's suggestion, *satis claret*, gives good sense, but this meaning of the verb is very rare (and it is never construed with an accusative and infinitive; see *TLL* 3. 1263. 72 ff.) before late Latin. Much safer would be *satis patet* (the word used in this declamation at 93. 16) or *satis liquet* (cf. 98. 16, 128. 21, 298. 16).

116. 31: iterum ingressa nocturnum iter, . . . vicit cursu aetatem sexum infirmitatem; *secuti* cives quidquid dixerat, quidquid fecerat mater. salus ergo civitatis et victoria qua nunc gaudemus huic debentur.

"Num cives dicuntur secuti esse quod illa fecerat? ineptum est" (Opitz). Many other instances of zeugma are equally inept. With *quidquid fecerat* we should expect something like *imitati* or *aemulati*. Her fellow-citizens followed up the information which the woman had given about the enemy's plans, and showed the same bravery as she had shown in what she did; so the victory is really due to her.

128. 8: *duas enim sine dubio poenas adversus raptorem lex constituit, alteram tamen mitem; nec semper †hac cogitata et publicata† crudeli illi et sanguinariae †tenetur†. hodieque [alioquin] nonne merito a vobis, merito a civitate reprehenderetur si, aliud non optando, hoc ostenderet et fecisse raptorem quod ipsa esset optatura?*

A girl who was raped could opt either for the death of the offender or for marrying him. In the present case the offender committed suicide before the girl could make her choice; the speaker argues that she should still have the opportunity of showing that she would *not* have opted for his death.

In the obelized sentence nothing is gained by merely altering the datives *illi* and *sanguinariae* to ablatives. The argument seems to demand "and yet it is not always that this [read *haec* for *hac*] milder penalty [marriage] is chosen in preference to the cruel one [death]." I suggest that *tenetur* conceals something like *<an>tefertur*. It is more difficult to make sense of *cogitata et publicata*; I suggest *cogente <humani>tate publica*, "under the pressure of public opinion in favor of clemency." For *publica humanitas* cf. 39. 29 "non enim causa victus est sed . . . publica humanitate"; 41. 14 "impedimento publicae humanitatis victus est"; 42. 27 "imputabitis istud publicae misericordiae, imputabitis humanitati"; *Decl. mai.* p. 113. 16 (Lehnert); also "publica clementia" ib. p. 266. 3 and "publici affectus" (5 examples in Lehnert's Index). For the ablative absolute cf. 234. 4 "aliquo [neut.] cogente."

Ritter seems justified in deleting *alioqui(n)* as a dittography of *hodieque*; cf. note on 61. 12 above.

The *et* after *ostenderet* should either be deleted as a dittography of the end of that word (so Morawski) or (preferably) combined with *fecisse* to produce *effecisse*.

158. 21: *nec mihi, iudices, in animo est excusare vitam priorem, nec ut me dicam numquam dignum fuisse abdicatione, sed ut me †putem diu fecisse† abdicatum.*

fecisse A: fuisse B

The speaker is a son "abdicated" by his father for extravagance, later taken back, and now once more "abdicated."

It is clear that the obelized passage contained (a) a "verbum dicendi," (b) an infinitive of which *me* can be the subject. For (a) the only feasible suggestion available is Gronovius' *probem*; much easier palaeographically, I suggest, is <dis>putem. For (b) there is no reason to search farther than B's reading *fuisse* (of which *fecisse* is an easy corruption), but a small insertion is necessary to make satisfactory sense: read *sed ut me* <dis>putem <satis> diu *fuisse abdicatum*.

169. 24: obici tibi potest quod tam impius es ut fratrem post illam miseram fortunam non videris nisi ad te *descendentem*.

The person addressed can be reproached for not having seen his brother since the latter went into exile, until he invited him to return illegally for a dinner-party. (Instead of doing so, he should have gone to visit him in exile.)

It is impossible to attach any relevant sense to *descendentem*. Emendation is certain: read *discumbentem* (*ad te* = "at your house"). As *TLL* (5. 1. 1365. 16) says, this verb is occasionally used "de singulis," as at Quintilian, *Inst.* XI. 2. 13.

175. 14: scilicet illa honestiora, debilitatem pati et †ferre infestos numinibus† oculos.

The *debilitas* in question is blindness. As Gronovius realized, the reference in the obelized passage is to the fact that blindness, like every other form of physical disability, is a bad omen not only (e.g.) at weddings (cf. *Decl. mai.* p. 14. 25 ff. Lehnert) but also at sacrifices; cf. Seneca, *Contr.* X. 4. 8 (of children with various kinds of bodily deformity, including blindness) "occurrunt nuptiis dira omina, sacris publicis tristia auspicia"; Gronovius therefore altered *numinibus* to *ominibus*. He ought also to have altered *infestos* to *infaustos*; indeed, perhaps this is the only change required, since *numinibus* can be taken as a "dativus iudicantis."

176. 21: mihi rus paternum erga labores gratissimum, non frugalitati tantum suffecturum sed et delectationi si coleretur a dominis duobus. hoc cum †dio evenissem†, ne haec quidem ducendae uxoris et educandorum liberorum onera recusavi, ut relictum a parentibus meis relinquerem filio meo.

Ritter adopts Rohde's alteration of *a dominis* to *ac dominis*, going with *suffecturum*. This is no gain, since it leaves *si coleretur* impossibly

bare, and the sense which it expresses, that the farm would be capable of supporting two masters, is present by implication in the *paradosis*.

The vulgate, *hoc cum diu evenisset*, is almost meaningless. The only suggestion reported by Ritter is Rohde's *hoc* [*sc. rus*] *cum diu* *<solus> coluisse*, but *coluisse* is improbable both in itself as an emendation of *evenissem* and as coming so soon after *coleretur* (besides, the insertion of *solus* seems gratuitous). *hoc* may be not (as Rohde assumes) the farm itself but its adequacy just mentioned; in that case I suggest *hoc cum divinasset*, "foreseeing that the farm would be capable of supporting two masters, I took steps to procure myself a son."

177. 1: *misi in civitatem* [*sc. filium meum*]; *delicator venit* et redire properavit.

Perhaps rather *<re>venit*. At 254. 22 we find *venissent* with the same meaning as the preceding *reverterentur*; but in our passage the loss of *re* would be particularly easy.

177. 9: *ad domum divitis veni*, [*non enim*] *nomen inter non agnoscentes requisivi*; *parasitus inventus est*.

non enim del. Rohde

It was not the rich man but the speaker's son who was discovered to be a parasite. Therefore the object of *requisivi* must be *filium*, which has presumably been supplanted by *non enim*, an anticipation of the following word; and that following word should be not *nomen* but *nomine*: "I asked for my son by name, but no one recognized the name."

177. 14: *in praesentia hoc uno contentus sum*: *suscipe laboris tui partem*. *satis sine te laboravimus*.

Ritter follows Rohde in changing *tui* to *mei*. Perhaps *tuam* would be easier.

178. 6: *num me irasci putas?* *misereor*: *ubi haeserunt tibi vitia civitatis*.

Ritter deletes *ubi*, presumably as an erroneous anticipation of the following *tibi*. Rohde suggested reading *tibi* with *misereor*, but examples of a dative with this verb should not be increased by conjecture (cf. *TLL* 8. 1118. 74 ff.). Another possibility is the rather rare compound *obhaeserunt*; cf. Seneca, *Dial.* IX. 8. 3 "utrique [*sc. pauperi et diviti*] . . . pecunia sua obhaesit."

187. 17: †alioqui ius in me† humanitatis est nostra frugalitas, quae vobis utique velut refectionem quandam et quietem praebet.

A poor man (the speaker) has invited a rich man to dinner.

In the obelized passage the older editors made several wild suggestions. The only modern contribution of any note is Rohde's *alioqui summae*: quite possible palaeographically, but not really satisfactory in sense since the poor man would hardly make such a boastful claim for his own frugal hospitality. At most he would claim "aliqua humanitas"; so perhaps *alicuius autem humanitatis*, "shows considerable refinement."

189. 19: in ipso vero raptu non apparuit tibi ancillam non esse? non tamquam libera repugnavit? non proclamavit patrem? *nullam vocem meam audisti?* fieri non potest ut non eruperit ingenuitas.

It must have been obvious to the rich man that the girl he was raping was not a servant-girl but the daughter of his host, who is the speaker.

Ritter reports that *meam* was judged by Rohde to be absurd, as indeed it is if it produces the meaning "no word uttered by me"; the father cannot have uttered anything at all, or even been present, while his daughter was being raped. The sense must be "did not any word she uttered show you that she was an *ingenua*, not an *ancilla*?" L. Håkanson (*Cl. et Med.* dissert. ix [1973], 314) obtains this sense by reading *nulla voce*, "hörtest du denn aus keinem Wort dass sie meine Tochter war?," but this puts an impossible strain both on the ablative *voce* and on the accusative *meam*. Nevertheless the ablative might be a good idea with some verb other than *audisti*; perhaps *agnovisti*, "did no cry of hers enable you to recognize my daughter?" In that case *agnovisti* in line 27 will be intentional repetition: "you did not recognize my daughter, but recognized only your own compulsive sexual urge."

196. 18: quid ego faciem tristissimi illius *temporis* narrem? quid vulnera? quid sanguinem?

Two men are engaging in single combat.

For *temporis* Ritter adopts Rohde's *contentionis* but (by an oversight) fails to change the gender of *tristissimi*; the double change tells against this emendation. If *temporis* is corrupt, *certaminis* would be preferable. Or perhaps *paris*, "pair of combatants"; *faciem* might be thought to go better with this than with a word meaning "contest."

205. 15: nunc vero propiores admovet stimulos vir fortis. haec suum negaret? te parentes liberis suis monstrant. scilicet †timet ne ad illam† matronae convenient.

A woman refuses to recognize as her son a "vir fortis" who is universally admired; would she do so if he *were* her son?

Nothing credible has been proposed for the obelized passage. Perhaps it would be easiest to insert *non* before *timet* and change *illam* to *illum*: "why, she is not afraid that the matrons (the mothers of eligible daughters) will gather round him."

207. 27: iungit enim amicitias similitudo morum; nescio quomodo inter sese animorum †nomina† vident et agnoscunt.

A originally read *nomina*, which has been changed to *numina*, and the latter has become the vulgate; but *animorum numina* is an incredible expression. Obrecht's *lumina* at first sight appears to be a good emendation of *numina* ("the eyes of people's souls see and recognize one another"), but *lumina* is really superfluous with *vident*. If one starts from *nomina* rather than from *numina*, an obvious conjecture would be *hominum*; and *animi hominum* may well have been the original, *animi* having become *animorum* under the influence of the preceding *morum*. The author may have been influenced by Cicero, *Off.* I. 56 and 58, *Lael.* 50.

221. 11: sed postea fortiter pugnando ostenderat non eos esse mores suos, non *suam* vitam, ut in illo credibilia haec crimina forent.

Ritter follows Rohde in correcting *suam* to *eam*. Certainly the anaphora shows *eam* to be necessary, but it has more probably dropped out before *suam* than been corrupted to *suam*. So read *non* <*eam*> *suam vitam*.

231. 14: cum suspectus esset reus, boni erat civis accusare; neque aliter stare leges possunt neque aliter civitas. accusavit (*quid postea?*) quoniam homo occisus videbatur. "hic tamen perire potuit et occidi potuit, et hoc indignum est."

A man who had accused another of murder had good reasons for doing so, even although the accused turned out to be innocent.

For *quid postea?* = "what then?" see Landgraf on Cicero, *S. Rosc.* 80. In our passage I can make nothing of it; it would seem impossible for the phrase to be parenthetical. Perhaps it should be transposed to introduce the next sentence, *hic tamen* etc. In that sentence *hic* is the

man wrongfully accused; *perire potuit* and *occidi potuit* look like alternatives of which only one should stand in the text.

236. 4: sunt illa vera quae extremo miseri spiritu dicebantur, "dabis mihi, scelerate, poenas; persequar quandoque et occurram."

It was pointed out long ago that the passage in quotation marks is based on Virgil, *Aen.* IV. 384-86, but I have found no edition, either of the Declamations or of Virgil, which punctuates correctly, with a comma after *persequar* (*et* = "etiam").

237. 5: stabat profecto ante oculos laceratus et adhuc cruentus pater, ostendebat effusa vitalia; totus ille ante oculos locus, totum scelus mente et cogitatione †perflexum†.

The parricide must have been haunted by his father's ghost.

Suggested emendations of *perflexum* include *perfixum*, *perpensum*, *perspectum*, *reflexum*, *complexum*, *repetitum*; none of these is satisfactory. It does not seem that any verb compounded with *per* would fit the context, so that *per* may be the remains of <sem>*per*. In that case the best participle, from the point of view of both sense and rhythm, would be <in>*fixum*; cf. 89. 23 "ego me fecisse . . . confiteor; et, quamdiu vixero, semper hoc animo <to>, tota mente inhaerebit" (so Walter, *Philol.* 80 [1925], 442).

247. 11: . . . legum lator numquam profecto tam iniquus fuit ut periclitari ex eventu pugnae unius civitatem *summa*<*mque*> *rei publicae* vellet.

Gronovius may well have been right in advocating *summamque rem publicam* (not reported by Ritter). In this phrase the adjective is invariable in Cicero, but Plancus ap. *Fam.* X. 21. 1 uses the noun (*rei publicae summa*), if our manuscripts can be trusted. Since both the nominative and the oblique cases of *res publica* can be written *r. p.*, it is arguable that, in the few cases in which the noun appears in the manuscripts, it should be replaced by the adjective. (Just below, at line 30, it is possible, but by no means certain, that we should read *non fecit summae rei* <*publicae*> *discrimen*.)

250. 4: . . . cum alioqui praedivinaret hoc quod accidit, nullam apud istos fore amicitiae *summae*, nullam nostrae coniunctionis reverentiam.

The testator correctly foresaw that, after his death, his two freedmen would have no respect either for his friendship with them or for the bond between the testator and the speaker. *summae* should

clearly be *suae*, as Obrecht (not reported by Ritter) realized; the two words are easily confused (cf. Cicero, *Fam.* VIII. 14. 4) and particularly so here, where *summam* (noun) occurs five lines previously.

254. 18 (from the "theme" of a declamation): *ex duobus sociis alter in civitate erat, alter peregre. cum bello laboraret, civitas decrevit ut intra certum diem reverterentur qui abessent; qui non venissent multarentur publicatione bonorum. exacta est pars a praesente negotiatore †absentis†.*

The last word has no construction; it is clear that a word has been lost either before it or after it. Ritter adopts Rohde's suggestion *absentis* <*socio*>, but this addition is rendered superfluous by the preceding *ex duobus sociis*; it is not the way of these "themata" to duplicate information. Much more probable, on grounds of both meaning and palaeography, would be <*nomine*> *absentis*; for *nomine* preceding a genitive compare 81. 22 (likewise from a "theme") *nomine civitatis*.

255. 26: *quid est iustius quam compositum patrimonium habere condicione unius?*

Ritter adopts Gronovius' change of *condicione* to *condicionem*. This may be right, but equally possible and easy is Schulting's suggestion (not reported by Ritter) of *haberi* for *habere*.

265. 24: *habui occasionem †merendi†. diu insidiatus essem. potui tibi venenum dare de quo nihil suspicareris.*

The speaker admits that he had the opportunity of poisoning his brother if he had wished to do so.

The corruption must conceal a word of the same sort of meaning as *opprimendi* (Schulting) or *nocendi* (Rohde), but neither of these is satisfactory. And Ritter rightly warns that the corruption may not be confined to this word; in particular, *diu* arouses suspicion, and it is not clear how *insidiatus essem* fits into the context. I suggest that all these difficulties can be overcome by reading *habui occasionem perimendi tui*: <*si*> *insidiatus essem, potui* etc.

276. 22: *in caede enim spectanda sit damnatio, in sacrilegio tempus ipsum intuendum. quare? quoniam lex tua ita scripta est, "ut qui damnaverit bona possideat"; * * * possidere non potes. lex mea ita scripta est, "ut bona sacrilegi ad deum pertineant"; statim ergo ut fecit sacrilegium devotus huic poenae est, et ante ista bona ad deum pertinere coeperunt quam lex damnaret.*

This is one of the many cases in which a gerund(ive) like *spectandast* has been wrongly expanded.

The goods of someone who has committed sacrilege belong to the god from the moment of the crime; the goods of a murderer belong to the man who secures his conviction only after the conviction.

Those scholars who insert *quae* or *ea* or *haec* as the object of *possidere* are merely tinkering. The argument demands the insertion of something like *ante damnationem*. A semi-colon after *possideat* is essential to make the construction clear.

282. 3: *sedit* virtutum intellectum rerum natura; nulla tanta vitia sunt quae non meliora mirentur.

All men, even the vicious, appreciate and admire the virtues.

For *sedit* the available conjectures are *serit* (the vulgate), *fecit* (accepted by Ritter), *dedit*, and *dat*. Of these the first is the best, but I suggest that it can be improved upon by writing *<in>sevit*; cf. Horace, *Sat.* I. 3. 35 f., “numqua tibi vitiorum inseverit olim / natura,” where our manuscripts are divided between *inseverit* and *insederit*.

289. 12: *servum torsi, cubicularium eius qui occisus est; nihil in servo suspicatus sum alterius filii. nec potest mihi obici neglegentia quaestionis; quaesivi enim * * *. nec in hac diligentia suspicio adversus filium †alia†; †ipse demum qui erat percussus quaesivit†.*

A young man was suspected of having murdered his brother. Their father (the speaker) tortured the murdered man's slave to discover the truth.

“Locus graviter corruptus, necdum sanatus,” says Ritter, and gives it up in despair. I agree with Opitz that this may be too pessimistic. Opitz

- (a) marks, after *enim*, a lacuna in which he would insert *nimis* (the father tortured the slave so thoroughly that he killed him); I suggest that *diligenter* fits the context better;
- (b) changes *alia* to *alterum*, which I would adopt.

In the last sentence Opitz is unconvincing (*ipse demum quid comperissem quaesivi*). My suggestion would be *nempe <de illo> demum qui erat percussus quaesivi*, “of course I asked only about the murdered son, not about the other one.”

290. 2: *quae ratio tacendi fuit si filium meum fecisse credebam? quae ratio tacendi fuit apud ipsum? nam sive irascor, vindicari possum hac*

voce quam contra illum habeo, sive imputare indulgentiam volo, plus illi praestitero *si scierit se fecisse*.

Although the father tortured the murdered man's slave, he refused to divulge, even to his surviving son, what he had found out. If he was angry with that son, the evidence he had obtained would help him to get his revenge; if he was soft-hearted towards him, the son will consider it a greater kindness if he knows—what? Surely not that he had done the deed but that *his father knew* that he had done the deed. Read *si scierit* <*me scire*> *se fecisse*.

293. 19: non satis est ei [*sc. a tyrannicide*] qui servitutem rei publicae detraxerit, qui monstra haec quibus libertas laborat, qui homines ad deorum hominumque iniuriam natos . . . occiderit, dum vivit tantum honorari.

In this high-flown passage it is improbable that the middle *qui* clause lacked a verb of its own and had to make do with *occiderit*. I suggest that something like *sustulerit* has dropped out after *laborat*.

294. 29: non enim vulgaria sacramenta ducebant, nec sicut adversus alios tyrannos [*tenebat*] iniuriae tantum dolore urgebamur; incredibile est quid *non* ausura fuerit libertatis et salutis necessitas.

The populace was only too eager to attack the tyrant.

It is easy to delete *tenebat* but not so easy to explain its presence in the text. The only suggestion I can make is that it may be a misplaced variant for *ducebant*; cf. Caesar, *B. C.* II. 32. 9 "sacramento quo tenebamini"; Cicero, *Off.* III. 100 "iure iurando hostium teneretur."

In the second sentence there is an illogical conflation of an indirect and a direct question: (a) "incredibile est quid ausura fuerit"; (b) "quid non ausura fuit?" Or should *non* be deleted?

312. 31: accepi pecuniam, *votum*, spem futurae in posterum vitae.

A young man is talking of what he owes to a rich man who had paid for his higher education.

accepi votum has stood in the text for centuries because it makes some sort of sense: the young man had been "eloquentiae studiosus" (312. 5), and the rich man had made it possible for him to realize his ambition. Nevertheless *votum* is a corruption of *otium*, as is proved by 312. 6 "huius opibus peregrina studia [at Athens], clarissima exempla, *otium*, quo plurimum studiis confertur, sum consecutus."

317. 24: necessaria tamen vestra cognitio est *ut* non quia istud liberum esse innocentibus non oportet sed quia multi sunt qui sic conscientiam evitant.

evitant *Schulting*; emittunt *codd.*

The senate must investigate a man's reasons for wishing to commit suicide.

The vulgate replaces *ut* by *utique*. Ritter prefers to delete the word, but its presence in the text is difficult to explain. Perhaps parenthetical *puto*.

320. 17: mirantur me <in> latrones incidisse: solet fieri, *summum* est, *sequens*, scio.

Ritter adopts Obrecht's *humanum* for *summum* and Gronovius' *frequens* for *sequens*. The latter seems certain, but the former is not so satisfactory; *summum* is hardly likely to be a corruption of *humanum*. Perhaps *summe est frequens*.

324. 10: "sed animus tamen is fuit pacti huius ut totum aes alienum meum fieret." spectemus ergo †totum† animum; neque enim ego negaverim id intuitos esse nos et ita cogitasse, ut omne aes alienum tu solveres.

The obelized word is clearly an erroneous repetition of the preceding *totum*, and the word (if any) which it has supplanted need not bear a very close resemblance to it. The suggestions which have been made are *solum* (Aerodius), *tantum* (Rohde), and *etiam* (Ritter). Perhaps rather *nostrum* or *amborum*; the former is supported by the following *nos*; the latter by line 24 "sive animum spectas, is *utriusque* [*sc. nostrum*] fuit ut" etc.

332. 18 [loquitur matris advocatus]: . . . tamen hoc confiteor, non eam [*sc. matrem*] cum ipso quem ex diversis videtis subselliis litigare: *altior* gratia premit.

The mother is not in dispute with her ex-husband, the father of her son; what weighs against her is *altior gratia*. The speaker goes on to explain that he is referring to the evidence, given under torture, of the son's nurse; *gratia*, "influence," seems to be equivalent to *auctoritas*, the word which, in the immediately following context, is twice (lines 22 and 25) used of the nurse's evidence.

altior has apparently never been suspected, but I can attach no relevant sense to it and suggest that it should be *altera*.

334. 6: victor his tormentis nihil aliud quaerendum putavit, nihil dubitavit. in tormenta (ut parcissime dixerim) paria non vindico, sed rogo ut hoc velitis pertinere tantum ad ipsius causam.

The doubts of Ritter (and some of the early scholars) about this text seem unjustified.

"Having gained his point by these tortures of the nurse he thought no further investigation necessary and had no doubt about the truth. I do not claim anyone for (to put it mildly) equal tortures, but I ask you to take this as referring only to his own case."

The speaker seems to hint that, if he is successful in the present case, further legal action may follow, either against the poor man for fraudulently claiming paternity or against the step-mother for putting him up to do so (333. 16 ff.). In that case the speaker may, in his turn, ask for some torturing of slaves.

337. 14: alia est videlicet horum ratio quos brevis transitus voluptatis fecit parentes . . . : aliter *amant* quae *pepererunt*, quae memoriam decem *mensum*, quae tot periculorum, tot sollicitudinum recordationes ad vos, iudices, *adferunt*.

The speaker is contrasting the love of fathers (*horum*) and mothers (*quae pepererunt*) for their children.

The manuscript evidence (*amant* . . . *pepererint* . . . *affert* or *affret*) favors plurals rather than (as Ritter) singulars; and these tally better with the plurals in the first sentence. And there is no reason for not accepting *mensum*, the reading of our best manuscript; for the form see *TLL* 8. 746. 24 ff.

338. 14: post adversum proelium, quod quidem ipsi qui rebus Philippi favent *dolore* ac rumoribus in maius extollunt, non pacem petistis *etc.*

dolore is described by Morawski as "schwer verständlich und unpassend"; certainly it is hardly appropriate of the pro-Philip faction among the Athenians who exaggerated the king's victory at Chaeronea. Morawski tentatively suggests *colore*, but that does not seem convincing. More probably, I suggest, this is another instance of the confusion between *dolor* and *dolus*; perhaps just *dolo ac rumoribus* (the hendiadys is not inconceivable), or else *dolose* (or *-sis*) [*ac*] *rumoribus*. In the next sentence but two (line 25) the pro-Philip faction is said to employ "obliquae actiones."

339. 5: . . . neque adversus leges esse existimo quidquid . . . pro dignitate civitatis petimus et cui nulla lex scripta ex contrario *extat*.

nam si quod est ius quo contineatur hoc, ut mali etiam <et> turpes cives utique consiliis publicis intersint, videar fortasse hanc rogationem contra leges scripsisse. si vero nihil est quod ex contrario †coat†, non potest videri hoc adversus id scriptum esse quod non obstat.

There is no reason why *extat*, the manuscript reading, should be changed (as it is by Ritter, following Rohde) to *obstat*, despite the occurrence of that word at the end of the passage quoted; the dative *cui* is governed by *ex contrario*.

The original reading of A is *coat*, which has been changed to *coeat*; B has *cogat*. Schulting suggested *noceat*, Ritter *valeat*. Why not *constat*, which would here be the equivalent of the preceding *extat*?

343. 2: in libertate est igitur quisque caret forma servitutis. id, iudices, ex hac ipsa lege adhuc manifestum est. *non enim* legum lator putavit etiam eos qui a dominis fuga abessent esse in libertate; quod colligo scripto eius "qui voluntate domini in libertate fuerit"; apparet aliquos et non voluntate domini in libertate esse. quod si verum est, potest in libertate esse etiam qui liber non est.

The argument makes it clear that the sentence beginning *non enim* gives the opposite of the sense required, since the legislator believed that even runaway slaves *were* (temporarily) "in libertate." Ritter follows Rohde in emending *non enim* to *etenim*, but there is an easier solution: put a question-mark at the end of the sentence.

345. 3: rogamus vos, iudic(es, cogit)etis quam multa facere possit adversus puerum mango iratus: aut illi fortasse pretium, excisa virilitate, producet aut ob †infelicitis contumelia aeamnos† venibit in aliquod lupanar.

The obelized words are the original reading of A, corrected to *infelicitis contumeliae annos*.

Ritter notes that Rohde desiderated, in place of *infelicitis*, a word like *obnoxios* or *idoneos*. Such a word is *infestus* (*infestis* has been corrupted to *infelix* at Octavia 688). For the passive sense of *infestus* ("exposed to danger") see the passages listed in *TLL* 7. 1. 1410. 29 ff., especially Cicero, *Cael.* 10 "illud tempus aetatis quod ipsum sua sponte infirmum, aliorum autem libidine infestum est"; here, as elsewhere, an ablative of cause is added, which suggests that in our passage the ablative *contumelia* should be read. Another possibility is Opitz's *faciles contumeliae annos*; he compares *Decl. mai.* p. 18. 2 Lehnert "illum infelicem caecum, contumeliae opportunum, iniuriae facilem"; cf. also *TLL* 6. 1. 63. 40 ff.

356. 12: *navigavi ad piratas; . . . pauper hoc feci, rem diviti gravem, mihi * * * necessariam. et quare negata est? ut conlocaretur ei qui non redemerat etc.*

The father of a girl captured by pirates promised her in marriage to the man who should ransom her. Of her two suitors it was the poor man who did so, only to see her marry the rich man.

I doubt whether Ritter is justified in obelizing *necessariam*; it is difficult to think of any word of which it could be a corruption. More probably it is sound and there is a lacuna before it in which stood some mention of the girl; without such a mention the following *negata est* is abrupt. Perhaps something like *mihi* <*pro meo puellae amore*> *necessariam*.

360. 3: *non tu filium meum servasti sed tuum emendasti. una erat ratio, credo, illius ab eo quo flagrabat impetu: si amor transferretur.*

The rich man's motive in making it possible for the poor man's son to buy the meretrix was to cure his own son of his passion for her.

Rohde would keep *ratio* and insert *liberandi* (or *avertendi*) after *illius*. Ritter prefers to change *ratio* to <*cu*>*ratio*, but an *ab* construction would apparently be unexampled with this noun. A possible compromise, better than either of these, would be <*libe*>*ratio*.

368. 20: *mirer nunc ego unde rumor, quae tam maligno mendacio causa, cui fingere istud expedierit? ille profecto in causa fuit iuvenis qui in domum meam inductus est: quaesitus est locus.*

This passage concludes what Ritter (in his Index I, s.v. *locus*) calls a "locus de uxorum inconstantia." It seems clear that *locus* means "locus communis," and that the three italicized words have intruded from the margin. Such marginal notes are found elsewhere in A; e.g. 131. 26 "locus communis in ea quae adulterium gravida commiserit."

369. 19: "imperator in bello summam habeat potestatem." id quod obicitis ut nondum †obiciam†, propter bellum factum est, in bello factum est; usus sum igitur lege.

obiciam is clearly an erroneous repetition of the preceding *obicitis*. What is required is a verb like *defendam* or *purgem*: "I do not yet try to justify what I did: I merely claim that it was covered by the terms of the law." Gronovius suggested *diluam*.

371. 7: pro hac securitate si perierunt aliqui, ut parcissime dicam, non †ignoscerem†?

Victory in battle cannot be achieved without some losses, for which the commander should not be blamed.

Ritter adopts the old emendation *ignoscetis*, but the other instances in this declamation of a verb in the second person plural (369. 20; 371. 15, 16) refer to the accusers, not to the judges as representatives of the general public. Safer, I suggest, to posit a lacuna, e.g. *non <oportet> ignoscere?* (*oportet* is used at 370. 13.)

372. 22: quod enim huic †profecerunt† inimici odium praeter commune omnium proditorum?

The commander had no personal grudge against the prisoners whom he burned to death; he merely suspected them of being traitors to their country.

A originally read *profecerunt*, which has been corrected to the vulgate *proferunt*. A past tense, however, is required, and the obvious word is *obiecerunt*.

374. 7: vis scire, fili, quid sit dementia? deducere se in periculum capitis cupiditate; non intellegere pacem, non intellegere leges; et, si quid supra hoc momenti *fortuna praesens iudicium* habet, accusare eum qui exorandus sit.

A father, accused by his son of *dementia*, retorts that it is really the son who must suffer from *dementia* in endangering his life through lust (by committing rape), and indeed in bringing the present case against his father instead of trying to win him over by persuasion. The passage may have been influenced by Cicero, *Pis.* 47 "quid est aliud furere? non cognoscere homines? <immo> non cognoscere leges, non senatum, non civitatem."

Of the two nouns *fortuna* and *iudicium*, one is superfluous. If *fortuna* is original ("the present state of affairs"), *iudicium* ("the present trial") could well be an explanatory gloss on this; if *iudicium* is original, the addition of *fortuna* is inexplicable. It is also possible that *iudicium* is an accidental intrusion from line 13, where *praesens iudicium* occurs.

375. 15: aliquis, cum filia illius rapta sit, tam cito exoratus est? quis est ille tam demens? . . . quid est istud quod ille se accepisse iniuriam non putat? quod omnia sic agit tamquam *exoratus ante tricesimum diem?*

The law states that a rapist shall die unless within thirty days he

wins over both his own father and the father of the girl. In the case before the court the girl's father had been so accommodating that one might suspect he had connived at the rape in order to get a husband for his daughter.

Ritter adopts Rohde's insertion of *non* before *exoratus*, but I can see no sense in this: how can it be said that the girl's father was behaving as if he had *not* been won over when it is clear that he had been won over only too easily? On the other hand Ritter's idea that *ante tricesimum diem* is a scribe's insertion from the theme deserves consideration; but I suggest that only *tricesimum diem* be deleted as an erroneous gloss, leaving *tamquam exoratus ante* = "as though he had been won over beforehand" (i.e. before his daughter was raped).

394. 13: fuisse duos sodales. patribus ex austero * * * indulgentibus saepe coisse ad lusum, frequenter una fuisse.

Although obelized by Ritter, *ex austero* is probably genuine; *austero* makes a good contrast with *indulgentibus*, as was pointed out by Ihm in *TLL* 2. 1559. 82. But it cannot stand by itself; there must be a lacuna after it in which stood (a) a noun with which *austero* can agree, (b) a negative (already suggested by Opitz), since the whole context shows that the two fathers were *not* "indulgent" towards their sons. I suggest *ex austero* <*animo non*> *indulgentibus*, the ablative absolute being concessive.

402. 18: licet differre. permittes et tua causa: uxorem tibi opto, honores opto.

If the speaker, a man who has distinguished himself in war, is allowed to postpone his choice of reward, this may be in the interests of his son, since he may choose a wife, or public office, for his son (*tibi* with *honores opto* as well as with *uxorem opto*).

The tense of *opto* has aroused suspicion (*optabo* Aerodius), but becomes quite acceptable if we read *permittes et tua causa* <*si*> *uxorem* etc.

437. 27: quomodo autem potuit confusa facie agnosci [*sc.* cadaver]? "aetas" inquit "conveniebat": hoc inter argumenta mea minimum est. "statura": *hoc in actione loci*.

The italicized words yield no relevant meaning, and the few emendations which have been proposed are not worthy of mention. I suggest <*nihil habet*> *loci*, "is inapplicable"; for *locum habere* "in sermone iuris" see *TLL* 7. 2. 1598. 8 ff.

438. 14: sed haec [*sc. argumenta ex aetate et statura*] valeant ubi confusus est vultus: ubi lineamenta oris, *oculorum*, et coloris proprietas capillorumque habitus, omnia <aetati accedunt et> staturae, levia?

Although this sentence has always been punctuated as a statement, it is really a double question: "are these proofs to hold good in the one case but to be of small account in the other?"

Is *oculorum* governed by *lineamenta* or by *proprietas*? The former view is taken in *TLL* 7. 2. 1439. 45, where a passage of Cyprian is quoted which is irrelevant (it refers to a woman coloring the *lineamenta* of her eyes with the ancient equivalent of eye-shadow). I think that *lineamenta oculorum*, in the sense which it must bear in our passage, would be both unexampled and unconvincing. If the text is right, it would be better to take *oculorum* with *proprietas*, but the inconcinnity arouses suspicion; one would expect *oculorum*, like the other three genitives, to be governed by a noun of its own. I suggest <*obtus*> *oculorum* (which gives a good clausula); see the passages quoted in *TLL* 9. 2. 307. 43-50.

After *omnia* Rohde postulated a lacuna in which stood *denique accedunt*. The latter word is a brilliant suggestion, but the former is unnecessary; in its place I have inserted *aetati*, which is just as relevant in the context as *staturae*; and the general similarity of *aetati* and *staturae* helps to explain the omission.

440. 10: agnoscit avia [*sc. puerum*] . . .; "filius meus" inquit "in hac aetate talis fuit." *digna* est testis notitia: de nepote dicit causam, nullum testamentum captat.

The witness's knowledge of her grandson is worthy—of what? Of credence, I suggest, i.e. <*fide*> *digna*; unlike her daughter-in-law (the boy's mother) she has nothing to gain by lying. For *fides* in connection with evidence and witnesses cf. 292. 5 "fide testis" and the passages listed in *TLL* 6. 1. 684. 50 ff.

Ritter adopts Rohde's correction of *digna* to *magna*, but this does not fit the second of the reasons given, the disinterestedness of the witness.

440. 21: "odit me" inquit. quam habet iniuriam tuam? nihil queritur nisi quod filium tuum in litus duxisti; <i>deo perierat. *nimirum oscula sua venaliciario inquinat.*

The subject of *odit* is the boy's grandmother, of *inquit* the boy's mother, who is also the person addressed. The grandmother has no

complaint against the mother except that she took the boy to the seashore, where he disappeared: according to the mother, he was drowned (*perierat*); according to the speaker and the grandmother, he was carried off by pirates and eventually rescued from a slave-dealer's establishment.

Ritter confesses that he cannot understand the sentence in italics. The ironical *nimirum* shows that the mother's view is being stated: in kissing the boy rescued from the slave-dealer the grandmother is soiling her lips on an unknown slave. Read *venaliciari*<*i puer*>*o inquinat*.

440. 26: in multis [*sc. matribus*] nihil matris ultra titulum est; *nec novercae omnes*.

Whoever wrote the last three words presumably meant to say "nec novercae omnes sunt novercae": just as many mothers are mothers in name only, so not all stepmothers behave like stepmothers. Since no stepmother is involved in this declamation the thought is irrelevant; the three words would appear to be the remnant of a marginal comment.

Aberdeen, Scotland

8

Theory and Practice in the Vergilian Cento*

DAVID F. BRIGHT

The history of Greek and Latin poetry is marked—some would say marred—by periods of bizarre experimentation with forms which show ingenuity of a mechanical sort but are, all in all, devoid of merit as *belles-lettres*. Into this category one would presumably put the cento. It had a long if not particularly honorable history,¹ and representatives appear in many unexpected corners of the classical field: Aristophanes, Lucian, Diogenes Laertius etc.²

Yet among the quirks of literary taste and oddities of accomplishment, the cento holds a special place. Other curiosities such as *versus rhopalici* are nothing more than games, and show more interest in numerology than in words or ideas. They manipulate the language by finding (or even, it may be, inventing) exotic words, simply to show that an idea can be expressed by a sequence of words with

* This paper is dedicated to my friend and colleague John L. Heller. Limitations of space and exigencies of the production schedule prevented the work from appearing in last year's *Festschrift* issue; but I hope that Professor Heller will derive some additional pleasure from this slight prolonging of the celebration.

¹ Not, perhaps, as long as Crusius would claim (*RE* III. 2., cols. 1929-32): he would identify the Homeridae and the entire rhapsodic tradition as the first phase of the cento. But there is a fundamental difference between assembling consecutive verses of Homer to produce Homeric poetry, and combining non-consecutive pieces of Homeric verse to make an entirely new creation on the Christian Gospel (as was a not uncommon pursuit in the time of the Empress Eudocia: cf. *Tzetz. Chil.* X. 306).

² For a summary of our information on the ancient cento, see G. Salanitro, ed., *Osidio Geta: Medea* (Roma 1981), pp. 18-60; earlier and for some aspects more valuable is F. Ermini, *Il centone di Proba e la poesia centonaria latina* (Roma 1909), pp. 19-55.

arithmetically progressive numbers of syllables: never mind what the idea itself may be. Or again, a poet could aspire to a leipogrammatic summary of the *Odyssey*, or a *carmen figuratum*. These are mere juggler's tricks.

But the cento has two qualities which can raise it above its fellow literary freaks, although their effect is somewhat diminished in unskilled hands. First, it is composed entirely of verses and phrases already penned by a great poet—most frequently Homer or Vergil, although other poets were used for quarrying as well.³ This has a general effect of felicitous expression at least at the level of the phrase or the individual line: it is as if the centonist were speaking a language whose unit of vocabulary is not the word but the well-turned phrase. Of course even with this initial advantage, a composer of little talent can contrive effects and commit errors to set our teeth on edge. But because of the underlying quality of the component expressions, we are less constantly stunned by the inherent freakishness of the enterprise itself than is the case with such visual games as a poem in the shape of a bird, or an acrostic for which the eye must follow the first, twentieth and final letters of the lines vertically as well as reading the lines themselves—usually distorted to the limits of the language to achieve this crossword effect.

The second saving grace, rather less reliably present than felicitous expression but certainly more common than in other *jeux de technique*, is that the cento was often used for significant subjects. There was of course a tradition, inconsistently followed, of parodic treatment in the centos, both in the early stages (e.g. the *Batrachomyomachia*, assuming it belongs in this category) and in the later (e.g. *De alea*⁴ or Ausonius' *Cento nuptialis*⁵). But parody was certainly not the purpose behind the Christian centos, most notably Proba's *Cento Vergilianus de laudibus Christi*,⁶ or indeed behind Hosidius Geta's *Medea*. These poems show both a seriousness and an ambition which set them far from any tradition of *nugae* and parody. The loftiness of the model

³ The use of other poets is largely the phenomenon of a later era, up to and especially in the Renaissance: see the very full, if not very scholarly, work of O. Delepierre, *Tableau de la littérature du centon*, 2 vols. (London 1874-75).

⁴ *Anth. Lat.* ed. A. Riese—F. Buecheler (Leipzig 1894), I. 1, pp. 34-38.

⁵ Ausonius XIX: *Cento nuptialis*. Most recent text in S. Prete, *D. Magni Ausonii opuscula* (Leipzig 1978), pp. 159-69.

⁶ Cf. Ermini (above, n.2); C. Schenkl, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* XVI (*Poetae christiani minores*: Vienna 1888), pp. 568-609; and now see E. A. Clark and D. F. Hatch, *The Golden Bough, The Oaken Cross. The Virgilian Cento of Faltonia Betitia Proba* (American Academy of Religion Texts and Translations 5: Scholars Press 1981).

will surely have had some effect. The two most predictable responses to greatness are imitation and mockery. Both are present in the centos. To this extent, Crusius greatly overstated the importance of parody in the genre as a whole.⁷

Even the form imparts a kind of authenticity as literature, as the cento preserves the epic form and frequently treats mythological or quasi-epic subjects. There is of course the important exception of Hosidius' tragic drama, but obviously it serves to strengthen the case for a serious tradition. And even the epithalamia of Ausonius and Luxorius,⁸ spiced as they are with wit and in Ausonius' case self-deprecation,⁹ nevertheless are representatives of a recognized literary tradition. The cento aspires to keep the company of its literary betters, and is much closer to the generic mainstream of literature than other sports of composition.

And yet when these allowances are made, the cento remains for modern readers as it was for Jerome¹⁰ a puzzling and often silly ambition. Proba's evangelical cento brings to mind Dr. Johnson's cheerfully chauvinistic remark: "A woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hinder legs. It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all."

The basic technique of the cento is straightforward enough in theory: the poet patched together¹¹ verses, or pieces of verses, from Vergil and thereby composed a different poem on an entirely unrelated subject. It was a prodigious feat of memory to keep the entire text of Vergil available in one's mind for quoting. Obviously the centonist will have had a copy of Vergil at hand for verification, but the process depended primarily on summoning phrases and lines entirely out of context: *solae memoriae negotium sparsa colligere et integrare lacerata*, says Ausonius (*praef.* 4). It is astonishing to contemplate the number of poets, over a span of centuries, for whom this exercise was possible: the value placed on the poet whose text was

⁷ Crusius (above, n.1). The notion that the cento is essentially parodic is incautiously introduced into most discussions of the form.

⁸ *Epithalamium Fridi*: text in Riese—Buecheler, pp. 79-82. The only major treatment of Luxorius is M. Rosenblum, *Luxorius. A Latin Poet Among the Vandals* (New York 1961).

⁹ Auson., *c. nupt. praef.*: *frivolum et nullius pretii opusculum . . . piget enim Vergiliani carminis dignitatem tam ioculari dehonestasse materia etc.*

¹⁰ Jerome, *Epist.* 103. 7: *puerilia haec sunt . . .*

¹¹ Originally *κέντρων* / cento referred to a patchwork cloak: cf. Crusius 1929-30 for the relevant texts, and Ermini, pp. 19 ff. on the evolution of the word into a literary term. Cf. also W. Belardi, "Nomi del centone nelle lingue indoeuropee," *Ricerche linguistiche* 4 (1958), pp. 29-57; Salanitro, pp. 11 ff.

so sedulously committed to memory can only be compared to modern instances of memorizing the entire Authorized Version of Scriptures. Moreover, it is clear that this feat was accomplished by persons of greatly varying talents, including some—such as Proba and Ausonius—who were in fact capable of original composition as well as making literary patchwork quilts.¹²

The cento has attracted occasional attention over the generations, and has recently become the topic of more extensive investigation.¹³ This scholarship has concentrated on the largest specimens of the genre, Proba and Hosidius. I should like to consider a few aspects of the art of the cento with reference to the centos found in the so-called *Latin Anthology* preserved in the Codex Salmasianus (Par. lat. 10318).¹⁴

This collection, compiled in the last years of the Vandal era in North Africa, contains many poems which may safely be regarded as originating in that region, and from this fact has grown a cumulative likelihood that most of the collection may represent the work of North African writers. The idea is encouraged as well by the pejorative argument that so much of the poetry is so bad that it surely would not have travelled far and still been thought worthy of collecting and preserving. As regards the centos in particular, nearly all the snippets of evidence point to North African origins. Ermini's passing observation that *Alcesta* may have been by an Italian poet does not compel

¹² Comparetti (*Vergil in the Middle Ages* I, p. 53) comments that "to know [Vergil's] works by heart from one end to the other was no uncommon feat," and goes on to assess centonists in these terms: "The idea of such 'Centos' could only have arisen among people who had learnt Vergil mechanically and did not know of any better use to which to put all those verses with which they had loaded their brains."

¹³ In addition to Salanitro, Ermini and Delepierre, the major items include B. Borgen, *De centonibus Homericis et Vergilianis* (Hauniae 1828); a series of articles between 1958 and 1960 by Rosa Lamacchia and her recent edition of Hosidius Geta's *Medea* (Leipzig 1981); and Fr. Desbordes, "Le corps étranger. Notes sur le centon en général et la Médée d'Hosidius Geta en particulier" in *Argonautica. Trois études sur l'imitation dans la littérature antique* (Coll. Latomus 159: Bruxelles 1979), pp. 83-108. Salanitro has also announced a major essay, recasting his introductory pages, to appear in *Aufstieg und Niedergang des römischen Welt*. There is a brief discussion in Stemplinger's *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (Berlin 1912), pp. 192 ff. For further bibliography see Salanitro, pp. 173-76.

¹⁴ *Anthologia latina sive poesis latinae supplementum*, edd. Fr. Buecheler et A. Riese, I. 1 (Leipzig 1894), pp. 31-296. Centos: pp. 33-82. The ms is perhaps more remembered—and appreciated—for preserving the *Pervigilium Veneris*. It also contains *inter multa alia* the poem of Luxorius and Reposianus' *De concubitu Martis et Veneris*.

assent, and even if true would not greatly weaken the case overall.¹⁵ The centos taken together suggest that they are more likely to be objects of regional interest and pride than of international admiration. A common African origin provides a cohesion to the group offsetting the apparent spread in date of some four centuries from Hosidius in the second century to Luxorius in the sixth.¹⁶ Most of the centos are without evidence of date and thus available for speculation.¹⁷

The sixth book of the *Anthology* preserves twelve centos in various states of completeness:¹⁸

7 <De panificio>	11 vv. extant (Riese pp. 33-34)
8 De alea	112 vv. (R. 34-38)
9 Narcissus	16 vv. (R. 38-39)
10 Mavortius (?): Iudicium Paridis	42 vv. (ending lost) (R. 39-41)
11 Hippodamia	164 vv. extant (R. 41-47)
12 Hercules et Antaeus	16 vv. (R. 47)
13 Progne et Philomela	24 vv. (R. 48)
14 Europa	34 vv. extant (R. 49-50)
15 Alcesta	162 vv. extant (R. 50-56)
16 Mavortius (?): De ecclesia	111 vv. extant ¹⁹ (R. 56-61)
17 Hosidius Geta: Medea	461 vv. (R. 61-79)
18 Luxorius: Epithalamium Fridi	68 vv. (R. 79-82)

To these we may add for the purposes of the discussion which follows:

Ausonius: Cento nuptialis	131 vv.
Pomponius, Versus ad gratiam Domini	132 vv. (CSEL XVI, pp. 609-15)
De Verbi incarnatione	111 vv. (CSEL XVI, pp. 615-20)
Proba, De laudibus Christi	666 vv. ²⁰

Taken together, these poems provide an interesting basis for observing differences in the ways a poet could handle his source

¹⁵ The author of *Alcesta* (R. 50-56) addresses Apollo as *summi custos Soractis* (19). But this is after all a Vergilian address to Apollo (actually V. has *sancti: Aen. XI. 785*), and Vergil's Italian status is not at issue.

¹⁶ Hosidius is dated on the assumption that our cento is indeed the *Medea* cento mentioned by Tertullian, *de praescr. haer.* 39. 5, as the work of a poet whose name is actually garbled in the MSS (Vosidius, Ovidius etc). Luxorius makes specific references to Vandals which permit a dating near the compilation itself.

¹⁷ See Schenkl (above n.6), pp. 509 ff. for some considerations: Ermini, pp. 42 ff.; Salanitro, pp. 36 ff.

¹⁸ I use the numbers in R(iese). The centos comprised Book VI of the *Anthology* as originally compiled.

¹⁹ Plus a six-line post-script not included in this discussion.

²⁰ Excluding the 29-line prologue, which is only partially centonic.

material. I shall briefly touch on three questions: 1) What rules are stated or deducible for the composition of a cento; 2) To what extent were these rules followed by the centonists; 3) Is it possible to make distinctions of authorship or of date on the basis of adherence to or departure from these rules?

Ausonius provides the clearest and most familiar instructions for the centonist:

Variis de locis sensibusque diversis quaedam carminis structura solidatur, in unum versum ut coeant aut caesi duo aut unus et sequens medius cum medio. nam duos iunctim locare ineptum est, et tres una serie merae nugae. diffinduntur autem per caesuras omnes quas recipit versus heroicus, convenire ut possit aut penthemimeris cum reliquo anapaestico, aut trochaice cum posteriore segmento, aut septem semipedes cum anapaestico chorico, aut <sequatur> post dactylum atque semipedem quidquid restat hexametro. (Praef. 25-32 Prete)

From this account we may derive the following rules of the game:

- a) The juncture within a line should only occur at the places where a caesura is permitted in Vergil: ~~~~ || etc.; ~~~~~~ || etc.; ~~~~~~ || etc.; and ~~~~~~ || etc. There should not be pieces of other sizes than those which caesurae create.
- b) If a line does not consist of a Vergilian verse reused in its entirety, it should consist of two pieces and no more.
- c) The longest continuous quotation approved is 1½ verses (whatever exact meaning *medius* may bear).
- d) The components should present the text of Vergil unchanged, although the meaning of the words may be altered by their new context.

The simplest way to set forth the extent to which the centonists followed or ignored the rules I have described is to tabulate the data as in Table 1, which gives for each poem: the total lines (col. 1); the number (and percentage) of lines which are taken whole from Vergil (col. 2); composed of 2 Vergilian sources (col. 3); composed of 3 or 4 pieces (col. 4); containing additions by the centonist—as distinct from Vergilian text which has been altered (col. 5); and the number of instances of quotations extending unbroken for more than 1½ verses (col. 6).

Obviously whenever a line is built of 3 (or even 4) components, the metrical control described by Ausonius has been ignored (note that Ausonius himself did not exercise this freedom). Oddly, Ausonius does not mention using isolated whole lines, but it is of course a principal option, generally accounting for one-fourth to one-third of

TABLE 1 — COMPOSITION OF VERSES

POEM	1 Total Lines	2 Whole Lines No. %	3 2-Source Lines No. %	4 3+ Sources No. %	5 Original Add. No. %	6 Longer Than 1½ consec.
De panificio	11	1 9.1	10 90.9	0 0	0 0	0
De alea	112	27 24.1	70 62.5	10 8.9	5 4.5	0
Narcissus	16	3 18.75	13 81.25	0 0	0 0	0
Iudicium Paridis	42	14 33.3	28 66.7	0 0	0 0	1
Hippodamia	164	36 22.0	126 76.8	1 0.6	1 0.6	0
Heracles & Antaeus	16	3 18.75	13 81.25	0 0	0 0	0
Progne & Philomela	24	0 0	20 83.3	3 12.5	1 4.2	0
Europa	34	7 20.6	27 79.4	0 0	0 0	0
Alceste	162	59 36.4	101 62.4	0 0	2 1.2	1
Epithalamium Fridi	68	37 54.4	27 39.7	3 4.4	1 1.5	4
De ecclesia	111	30 27.0	65 58.6	11 10.0	5 4.5	2
Centio nuptialis	131	48 36.6	83 63.4	0 0	0 0	1
Ad gratiam Domini	132	52 39.4	75 56.8	4 3.0	1 0.8	5
De Verbi incarnatione	111	43 38.7	60 54.1	7 6.3	0 0	3
Hosidius: Medea*	364	124 34.1	236 64.8	2 0.6	0 0	2
Proba (excl. prolog.)	666	251 37.7	400 60.1	15 2.2	0 0	7
MEAN		28.2	67.9	2.8	1.1	

* I.e. excluding the choral passages, which consist of paroemiacs, and counting all dialogue whether the lines are complete or not.

all lines. As this proportion increases, so does the temptation to use consecutive complete verses of Vergil, the opposite fault from excessive fragmentation. This Ausonius does only once (*c. nupt.* 25-26 = *Aen.* VI. 645-46).

The normal distribution for all centos is: approximately one-third complete Vergilian verses, and slightly less than two-thirds verses comprising two segments. Verses containing three or more elements, including non-Vergilian material, account for only about one in forty lines. Against this background, we may observe some exceptions.

It is hardly surprising that *De panificio* has almost no complete Vergilian verses, as the subject matter is so far from Vergil. But the author is not unskilled, and has made minimal changes in the lines he has used. The same cannot be said for *Progne et Philomela*, whose author has not succeeded in using a single complete verse of Vergil, and yet has frequently failed to make coherent sense by the composite verses he has built. Moreover, as if further proof of his clumsiness were needed, he has three lines of 3 parts and one with an addition where the line would not work. The deviations for *Narcissus* and *Hercules et Antaeus* are not significant, since one more complete verse would move them into the average range.

At the other end of the spectrum is Luxorius. More than half of his lines are lifted entire from Vergil (many with modifications). His thoughts very often move in units of one line, and he apparently hunted through Vergil on this basis. He is also fond of using two full lines. He has the highest frequency of two-line quotations among the centonists, notably including lines 23-28 consisting of three successive couplets (*Aen.* VI. 646-47; I. 707-08; I. 663-64). Considering the fact that Luxorius is clearly imitating Ausonius' epithalamium in this poem,²¹ and thus had presumably read the earlier poet's strictures against such practices, this feature is even more surprising. Yet there are effective touches, and it is not altogether fair to complain (as do Schenkl and Ermini) that he sinks below his usual level of talent—a harsh statement.

The extreme is found in *Ad gratiam Domini*: on three occasions, the poet has followed Vergil continuously for more than two lines (14-15-16a; 32-33-34a; 46b-47-48a). But in each instance, the poet is expressing—or preserving Vergil's way of expressing—a single thought of real importance to his theme, and this would seem to justify the "violation" of the rules.

But the most skillful centonist of all is the author of *Europa*. That

²¹ So Luxorius borrows many of the same lines as Ausonius, sometimes for a similar purpose. Cf. Schenkl, p. 553, note 1 for a list.

poet has a rather high proportion of two-source lines (nearly 80%) and commensurately fewer whole lines. There are no three-piece lines and none with original phrases inserted by the poet. Moreover, he never even extends a quotation from one line into the next: there are no quotations involving enjambement, and no successive lines linked by a shared quotation. No other centonist comes close to this level of virtuosity. And on top of this, the cento reads smoothly and the story is presented coherently.

On the other hand, if we look at the frequency of verses composed of 3 or 4 elements, three poems stand out. In *De alea* this occurs once in every eleven lines, and there are five more with non-Vergilian fillers. Many lines are unintelligible or startlingly clumsy, as if the author could not find or make a proper way to express his thoughts. The problem seems to be not so much the thoughts as the poet, however. The poem is parodic in tone, but quite without sophistication.

Progne et Philomela has a "failure rate" of one in six lines, as noted earlier, and is altogether deplorable. As for *De ecclesia*, the problem lines amount to one in seven. This is attributable, at least in part, to the subject matter. Mavortius is a talented poet who has chosen a topic far from Vergil (a Christian liturgical event, complete with summaries of the Gospel). Because of this specialized theme, and because of his desire to sound as much like the Scriptures as possible, he is driven to alter and chop the Vergilian source material. Many of his full lines are bland or generic, and when this approach would not serve, Mavortius was driven most of the time to alter or splice. The poem reads far more smoothly than one might expect, and earns admiration for ingenuity different from *Europa* but perhaps no less demanding.²²

We might expect that Proba would show signs of a similar problem, but she does not (total aberrations: 2.2%, or average). But her poem is more narrative and more adapted to the epic style, including modelling Jesus to some extent on the heroic Aeneas.²³ As a result, she takes more complete verses unaltered (about 3 in every eight lines). But they are not evenly distributed: when she turns to more

²² On *De eccl.* and other Christian centos, cf. J.-L. Vidal, "Observaciones sobre centones virgilianos de tema cristiano," *Boletín del Inst. de Estudios helénicos* 3 (1973), pp. 53-64. The difficulty of Mavortius' task is reflected in the enthusiastic addendum with its prefatory "Cumque Mavortio clamaretur 'Maro iunior!' ad praesens hoc recitavit" etc.

²³ On this adaptation cf. Clark and Hatch in *Vergilius* 27 (1981), pp. 31-39 (some dubious statements, but an interesting approach).

specifically Christian themes she has fewer complete lines and more composite. The section on the fratricide of Cain, the anger of God, the age of iron and the Flood (285-312) in which 17 of the 28 verses are complete Vergilian lines, stands in contrast with the passage on the birth of Christ, the Magi and the slaughter of the Innocents (346-79), where only 5 of 34 verses are intact.

On the basis of these numbers, it would be risky to assert that any two centos *are* the work of the same poet, but it would seem more probable that the reverse is sometimes indicated. Surely *Progne et Philomela* and *Iudicium Paridis* are by different authors, and more significant perhaps are the differences between *Iudicium Paridis* and *De ecclesia*, both attributed to Mavortius. So also *Alcesta* and *Hippodamia*, which share other features such as halting sentence structure and a similar distribution of sources across the three Vergilian works,²⁴ show very different profiles when considered from the perspective of how they put their verses together. Luxorius can be seen as an aberration and Ausonius as something of a purist. There is apparently no clear-cut distinction between African and European practice, nor between early and late, although metrical howlers are somewhat less frequent in the later examples than in Hosidius. A Christian theme presented special difficulties, reflected in a greater frequency of multi-source lines and additions to the text.

Obviously it was not always possible for the centonist to keep Vergil's words unchanged. There are several types of alterations introduced. First, minor alterations in forms required to preserve syntax (*trahit* becomes *trahunt*). These are very frequent and presumably do not count against a centonist's faithfulness to his original. Second, the poet may find it necessary to adjust the sense of a borrowed phrase by replacement of a single word. Some of these are clever and perhaps pointed: e.g. Mavortius, *De eccl.* 18, in speaking of the birth of Jesus uses *Aen.* VII. 660 on the birth of Aventinus, son of Hercules and Rhea (*mixta deo mulier*):

furtivum partu sub luminis edidit oras

becomes

²⁴ The distribution of the centonists' source-lines over the three Vergilian works is the topic of a separate study now under preparation. The topic is also of some use in identifying differences in approach. For present purposes, I will note that *Alcesta* contains 254 Vergilian quotations distributed thus: *Aen.* 238 (94%), *Geor.* 9 (3.5%), *Ecl.* 7 (2.5%); *Hipp.* has 270: *Aen.* 249 (92%), *Geor.* 13 (5%), *Ecl.* 8 (3%). These numbers should be seen against the relative bulk of the three Vergilian works: *Aen.* = 76.6%, *Geor.* = 17%, *Ecl.* = 6.4%.

quem nobis partu sub luminis edidit oras,

thus facing, challenging and improving upon the pagan story of the woman giving birth to the son of a god.

Or again, the change may be in proper names. Treating specific myths meant that the centonist often needed to use the names of the characters involved, and impenetrable obscurity could result from failing to accommodate this need (*Hippodamia* for example suffers grievously from this). *Europa* 3 by a felicitous substitution takes *Ecl.* VI. 46 and replaces one bull-related heroine by another:

Europam nivei solatur amore iuveni.

A particularly ingenious case is Luxorius, *Epithalamium Fridi* 48-49. The poet borrows Juno's words (*Aen.* IV. 102-03) inciting Venus to her plan for uniting Dido and Aeneas:

communem hunc ergo populum paribusque regamus
auspiciis: liceat *Phrygio* servire marito

and puts the words into Venus' mouth as she addresses Amor (the first half of 48 is from *Aen.* I. 688, an exactly parallel scene to this):

occultum inspires ignem paribusque regamus
auspiciis: liceat *Frido* servire marito.

Vergil's words are used *sensibus diversis*, says Ausonius. One striking example will serve to illustrate this phenomenon which is woven through the entire fabric of the centos. It also falls under the heading of proper name adaptation. Hosidius takes *Geor.* II. 126, *Medea fert tristis sucos*, referring to the region of Media, and uses it (*Medea* 191) unchanged to refer to the Colchian princess mixing her poisons. We are apparently to think of *Μήδεια* with its proparoxytone being reproduced by this word.

Two other kinds of change amount to admissions of defeat. One is to add new text not found in Vergil, and thus only borrow part of a verse. *De ecclesia* 45, for instance, takes the first half of *Aen.* III. 519 (*dat clarum e caelo signum*), and then lamely fills the line with *nam tempore in illo*, which does not occur thus anywhere in Vergil. This step of simply adding non-Vergilian pieces is not common, and is found in only 7 of the centos under review. The worst offenders as noted earlier are *De alea* and *De ecclesia*, both of which topics may have presented their poets with intractable problems (although the instance just cited is hardly an obscure or specialized thought!). A kindred fault is to move a borrowed phrase to a new position in the

line when there is no available piece in the only open position (e.g. *Iudicium Paridis* 15: cf. *Aen.* VI. 562).

All these considerations suggest how complex an activity it was to compose a cento. Ausonius' sketch of the rules implies a far clearer picture than is actually the case. As with other poetic activities, we may discern differences of style, of method and of ability. Differentiations which are not evident from reading the centos begin to emerge from analyzing the centonists' treatment of their sources.

University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

9

Zu Claudians Invektive gegen Rufin

HERMANN FUNKE

Bereits ein halbes Jahrhundert nach dem Tode Kaiser Konstantins, der den christlichen Glauben zur Staatsreligion erhob, tritt das römische Heidentum in die letzte Phase seines Kampfes gegen die neue Religion, die es mit ihrem Anspruch auf absolute Geltung in unduldsamer Weise verfolgt. Da es weniger die Kaiser sind, sondern Bischöfe und Mönche, die die Verfolgung mit Härte, bisweilen mit Grausamkeit betreiben, suchen die Exponenten des Heidentums den Ausgleich mit dem Herrscher des Reiches selbst, und als Prüfstein sollte sich hier der bekannte Streit um den Altar der Victoria erweisen.¹ An diesem Altar, der den Senatssaal schmückte, pflegten die Senatoren vor Sitzungsbeginn der Schutzgöttin des Reiches zu opfern. Der Nachfolger Konstantins, Constantius II., hatte bei seinem Rombesuch im Jahre 357 den Victoriaaltar aus der Kurie entfernen lassen, jedoch die Vorrechte des Heidentums und seine Priesterschaften unangetastet gelassen. Nachdem der Altar unter Julian wieder an seinen Platz zurückgebracht worden war, ließ Gratian ihn im Jahre 382 erneut entfernen, weil er nicht dulden wollte, daß christliche Senatoren gezwungen werden sollten, hier Götzenopfer zu verrichten. Eine heidnische Gesandtschaft, die um Wiederherstellung des alten Zustandes einkam, wurde am Hof von Mailand nicht vorgelassen. Der zwei Jahre später unter Gratians jungem Nachfolger Valentinian erneuerte Versuch, dem der Redner Symmachus mit seiner berühmten dritten *Relatio* Nachdruck verlieh, hätte Erfolg gehabt, wenn nicht der Bischof Ambrosius das Gewicht seiner Persönlichkeit gegen-

¹ Zum folgenden vgl. vor allem O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 5 (Berlin 1913); E. Stein, *Geschichte des spättrömischen Reiches* 1 (Wien 1928).

über dem schwankenden Kaiser ausgespielt und gleichzeitig das Übergewicht des religiösen Argumentes über das der Staatsraison dokumentiert hätte. Während Valentinian sich trotz dieser Niederlage weiterhin eines guten Verhältnisses zur heidnischen Partei erfreute, änderte sich die Lage entscheidend, als sein Nachfolger Theodosius die bestehenden Religionsgesetze verschärfte und die Zerstörung der Tempel anordnete. Die gereizte Stimmung der unterdrückten Heiden konnte sich sogar ein Christ wie der Usurpator Maximus zunutze machen, der im Jahre 387 einen Bürgerkrieg entfachte. Zwar konnte Theodosius ihn im folgenden Jahre schlagen, doch wurde seine heidenfeindliche Religionspolitik unter dem wachsenden Einfluß des Ambrosius zusehends rigoroser, so daß ein Konflikt jederzeit wieder ausbrechen konnte. Der in Reichsdiensten stehende Germanenfürher Arbogastes, der noch an der Seite des Kaisers gegen Maximus gekämpft hatte, hatte nicht nur seine Macht durch erfolgreiche Verteidigung der Rheingrenze befestigt, sondern auch persönliche Beziehungen zur heidnischen Senatspartei zu knüpfen gewußt und eine neuerliche Gesandtschaft unterstützt, die sich um die Wiederherstellung des Victoriaaltars bemühte, jedoch von Valentinian, der inzwischen ganz dem Einfluß des Ambrosius erlegen war, abschlägig beschieden wurde. Der plötzliche Tod Valentinians hatte ein Machtvakuum im Westen zur Folge, in welchem sich Arbogastes im Bündnis mit dem heidnischen Rhetor Flavius Eugenius zum Herrscher des Westreiches aufschwang. War dieser zunächst noch auf Ausgleich bedacht und lehnte er sogar zwei neue Begehren des Senats, den Altar der Victoria wiederaufzustellen, ab, so änderte sich die Lage durch eine weitere Verschärfung der Religionsgesetze des Theodosius im Jahre 392 entscheidend. Unter Eugenius ging das Heidentum zum letzten Male in die Offensive; jetzt wurden Tempel wieder geöffnet, geraubte Tempelgüter zurückgegeben, christliche Kirchen zerstört und Christen zur Rückkehr zum Heidentum überredet. Gegen diese politische und weltanschauliche Usurpation zog Theodosius nach langen Zurüstungen ins Feld und besiegte die Aufständischen in der Schlacht am Frigidus am 5. und 6. September 394. Von den Strapazen dieses Feldzuges erholte sich der Kaiser nicht mehr; er starb kurze Zeit später, am 17. Januar 395, und hinterließ dem Reich zwei unerwachsene Söhne, Honorius und Arcadius, elf und siebzehn Jahre alt. Ihre Herrschaft übernahmen die Männer, die Theodosius ihnen noch zu Lebzeiten als Vormünder bestellt hatte, für Arcadius der *praefectus praetorii orientis* Rufinus und für Honorius der *magister militum* Stilicho.

Schon der ältere der beiden Kaisersöhne, Arcadius, war eine

auffallend schwache Persönlichkeit; stumpfsinnig, träge und schläfrig wird er von seinen Zeitgenossen geschildert, und dieser Umstand war so bekannt, daß Synesius es anläßlich einer Gesandtschaft seiner Vaterstadt Kyrene wagen konnte, statt des üblichen und erwarteten Panegyricus den Kaiser unverblümt an seine Pflichten als Herrscher zu erinnern. Theodosius selbst schien die Fähigkeiten seines Sohnes nicht hoch eingeschätzt zu haben, hatte er ihn doch nicht nur nicht nominell zum Vormund seines jüngeren Bruders bestimmt,² sondern ihm lediglich die Präfektur des Ostens zugewiesen, während er Stilicho die Regentschaft über das ganze Reich anvertraut hatte. Letzteres wurde jedenfalls von der westlichen Propaganda ebenso laut behauptet wie von der östlichen energisch bestritten.³ Dazu kamen Differenzen über den Grenzverlauf zwischen dem östlichen und westlichen Herrschaftsgebiet; während man in Konstantinopel die strittigen Diözesen Dazien und Mazedonien aufgrund der älteren und damit ranghöheren Augustuswürde des Arcadius für sich reklamierte, gründete Stilicho seinen Anspruch offenbar auf den letzten Willen des Theodosius. Schließlich ließ der Umstand, daß die Exponenten der beiden Reichshälften, Stilicho und Rufin, einander bereits unter Theodosius mit Erbitterung und Feindseligkeit verfolgten, für die nächste Zukunft wenig Gutes erwarten.

Eugenius hatte seinen Putschversuch auf die Heeresmacht des westlichen Reichsteiles gestützt, Theodosius das Heer der östlichen Reichshälfte angeführt. Da die Reste der besiegten Aufständischen zu den kaiserlichen Truppen übergetreten waren, — Theodosius war kurz nach der Schlacht am Frigidus gestorben — hatte Stilicho das gesamte Heer in seiner Hand und hätte sich Konstantinopels ohne Widerstand bemächtigen und damit die Reichseinheit unter seiner Herrschaft wiederherstellen bzw. behaupten können. Er zögerte jedoch — der ehemalige gemeine Soldat vandalischer Abstammung, der zu dem höchsten Amt, das der Kaiser zu vergeben hatte, aufgestiegen war, mochte den Mangel an Legitimation spüren und wünschte deshalb, daß Arcadius ihn ersuchte, auch die östliche Reichshälfte unter seinen Schutz zu nehmen. Da ein solches Ersuchen jedoch am Widerstande Rufins, dessen Macht über Arcadius und Ostrom damit ein Ende gesetzt worden wäre, scheitern mußte, brauchte man einen Vorwand, und zu diesem boten sich die verbündeten Goten an, die in der Schlacht am Frigidus auf seiten des Kaisers große Verluste erlitten hatten. Da ihre Reste weiterhin als barbarischer Fremdkörper im römischen Heere betrachtet wurden, war es für ihren germani-

² Nach einer Vermutung Steins, S. 346.

³ Seeck, S. 272, Stein a.a.O.

schen Landsmann Stilicho keine große Mühe, sie auf seine Seite zu ziehen. Gleichzeitig streute Stilicho das Gerücht aus, Rufin, dessen Regiment sich durch Heimtücke und Habgier auszeichnete, habe die unter Alarich plündernd herumziehenden Gotenhorden nach Mazedonien und in das östliche Illyricum gelockt, um ihm seinen Anspruch auf die strittigen Diözesen zu verleiden. Dadurch verschaffte sich Stilicho Vorwand und Anlaß, im Orient militärisch einzugreifen. Als er in Thessalien auf die Truppen Alarichs stieß, blieb er zunächst untätig in der Hoffnung, von Arcadius den offiziellen Befehl zum Schutze des Ostreiches zu erhalten. Seine Untätigkeit wurde jedoch bei Hofe als Schwäche ausgelegt und ihm daher auf Betreiben Rufins der Befehl des Arcadius erteilt, die östlichen Truppen aus seinem Heer auszugliedern und nach Konstantinopel zurückzuschicken. Während Stilicho vorgab, dem Befehl des rangälteren Augustus zu gehorchen und dessen Oberhoheit über das östliche Illyricum anzuerkennen, kreiste er in Wirklichkeit Rufin durch eine Intrige ein, an der auch Eutropius mitwirkte, der in Konstantinopel bereits seit einiger Zeit auf den Sturz des *praefectus orientis* hinarbeitete. Stilicho ließ die abgerufenen Truppenteile von dem *magister militum* Gainas, einem Mann seines Vertrauens und Mitwisser des Komplotts, nach Konstantinopel führen. Als sie in der Stadt angekommen waren, kam ihnen der Kaiser, der Sitte gemäß, in Begleitung seines Präfekten zur Begrüßung entgegen. Während er die Front abschritt, fielen die Soldaten auf einen Wink des Gainas über Rufin her. Von allen Seiten hieb man mit Schwertern auf ihn ein. Von überall her stürzte das Volk herbei, um den Tod des Verhaßten zu bejubeln. Sein Leichnam wurde zerstückelt, sein Kopf auf einer Stange durch die Stadt getragen und mit Steinen beworfen; die abgehauene Rechte ließ man, indem man an ihren Sehnen zog, zur Verhöhnung seiner Habgier die Bewegung des Zugreifens machen—dieselbe Hand, die eben noch bereit war, zum Szepter des Reiches zu greifen. Unbegraben ließ man den Leichnam dessen, der selbst so viele ins Grab gebracht hatte.

Gegen diesen Rufinus schreibt Claudian eine Invektive in zwei Büchern, von der Schanz—Hosius in ihrer Literaturgeschichte lapidar bemerken: "Gegen den toten Rufinus ist die Invektive geschrieben und schon darum unedel."⁴ Der Dichter Claudian hätte folglich durch das Medium seiner Kunst nichts anderes getan als der Pöbel von Konstantinopel, nämlich den Leichnam eines Feindes geschändet.

Schanz—Hosius geben mit ihrer Datierung der Rufininvektive

⁴ *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* IV. 2 (München 1920), S. 9.

und der daraus folgenden Charakterisierung ihres Dichters, den sie im übrigen den "letzten bedeutenden Dichter der Römer"⁵ nennen, die *communis opinio* wieder. Theodor Birt hatte in seiner Claudianausgabe in den *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (1892) die Abfassungszeit des Werkes auf Dezember 395 bis Juli 396 festgestellt und lediglich die *praefatio* zum zweiten Buch auf Mitte 397 datiert.⁶ Das Urteil Birts wurde von der Forschung mit geringfügigen Modifikationen übernommen. Pierre Fargues formuliert in seiner Claudianmonographie von 1933: "Le Contre Rufin a dû être rédigé au debut de l'année 396,"⁷ und Harry Levy schreibt in seiner zwei Jahre später erschienenen Einzelausgabe der Rufininvective: "The two books In Rufinum, with the preface to the first book, were written early in 396."⁸ Aus der zeitgenössischen Claudianforschung seien zwei Antipoden zitiert, Alan Camerons Buch *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius* (1970) und sein Rezensent Christian Gnllka. Cameron datiert das 1. Buch "early in 396," und das 2. Buch "summer of 397," während Gnllka, der sich neben seiner Gnomonrezension des Cameronschen Buches in mehreren gleichzeitigen Aufsätzen zu Claudian geäußert hat, von der Invektive lediglich als einem "Gelegenheitsgedicht . . . nach dem Sturze Rufins" spricht.⁹ Immerhin stellt Joachim Classen 1974 in seiner Besprechung der um einen Kommentar erweiterten Neuauflage der Textausgabe Levys die Frage: "Wie kommt Claudian dazu, einen Toten zu schmähen?"¹⁰ Mögen die zitierten Äußerungen auch in Einzelheiten differieren, so datieren sie übereinstimmend Abfassung und Publikation der Invektive in die Zeit nach dem Tode Rufins. Ist dieses Werk also doch nur, wie es Otto Seeck in seiner *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* formuliert hat, ein Fußtritt für einen schon Gestürzten?¹¹ Und ist sein Autor derselbe, den Seeck einen Dichter genannt hat, "wie das Römertum der nachaugusteischen Zeit kaum einen zweiten hervorgebracht hat," und der für Ernst Stein in seiner *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches* "der letzte wahrhaft große Dichter des Altertums (ist), seit Vergil der wortgewaltigste, seit Ovid der fesselndste lateinische Epiker"?¹²

⁵ A.a.O. 3; über die genaue Abfassungszeit a.a.O. 10.

⁶ Birt, XXXVII.

⁷ Pierre Fargues, *Claudian. Études sur sa poésie et son temps* (Paris 1933), S. 15.

⁸ Levy 39 (= Cleveland 1971², S. 257).

⁹ Cameron, S. 78; Gnllka, "Dichtung und Geschichte im Werk Claudians": *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976), S. 97.

¹⁰ *Gnomon* (1974), S. 181.

¹¹ Seeck, S. 293 f.; vgl. Cameron, S. 84: "an invective . . . presumably almost at once after the murder."

¹² Seeck a.a.O.; Stein, S. 349.

Der in diesen Urteilen zutage tretende Widerspruch spiegelt sich bereits in der Darstellung des Inhaltes der Rufininvective bei den einzelnen Forschern wieder, so daß wir uns zunächst einen Überblick über das Werk verschaffen wollen. Dem 1. Buch ist eine praefatio in 18 Versen in elegischen Distichen vorangestellt. Darin wird die Tötung der pythischen Schlange durch Apollo als passender Vergleich für die Erlegung eines neuen Pytho, nämlich Rufins, angesehen. Es folgen die Begrüßung von Mitgliedern des Hofes als Hörern des Vortrags und der Preis Stilichos, der zum Schutze der Kaiser das Reich verteidigt. Zu Beginn des 1. Buches macht der Dichter sich Gedanken darüber, ob die Götter sich um die Geschicke der Menschen kümmern oder ob der blinde Zufall walte. Der Sturz Rufins läßt ihn schließlich an die Vorsehung der Götter glauben (1-24). Es folgt eine Versammlung der Furien in der Unterwelt. Allecto beklagt sich, daß unter Theodosius Friede und Wohlstand herrsche und daß es höchste Zeit für die Furien sei, ihrem Amt entsprechend (*quid Furias deceat*, 60) die Erde mit Verderben zu überziehen. Zu diesem Zwecke hat Megaera ein ganz besonderes Werkzeug bereit, das Scheusal Rufin, die Summe der Übel, die die Furien einzeln verkörpern (111). Das sicherste Mittel zum Ruin des Reiches ist, Rufin zum Minister am Hofe zu machen. Megaera erhält den Auftrag und bringt Rufin nach Konstantinopel, wo er sogleich mit Habsucht, Grausamkeit und Intrigen ans Werk geht. Dem Katalog seiner kriminellen Eigenschaften und Umtriebe stellt Claudian das Bild altrömischer Einfachheit und Ehrbarkeit gegenüber. Einzelne Taten Rufins werden in unbestimmt andeutender Weise, gleichzeitig aber in grellen Tönen geschildert, wie es dem Charakter der Invektive entspricht. Wichtiger als die Einhaltung einer Chronologie ist dem Dichter die Erzeugung eines Stimmungsbildes. Nicht die Karriere Rufins ist sein Gegenstand, sondern der Charakter dessen, der sich anschickt, das Reich an die Barbaren zu verraten und dessen Wüten nur von der starken Hand Stilichos Einhalt geboten werden kann. Stilichos Taten überragen alles bisher Gesehene, kein mythologisches Exempel ist gewaltig genug, mit ihm verglichen zu werden. Seinen künftigen Einsatz für das Reich hebt der Dichter gar in die Sphäre von Mars und Bellona und erreicht damit den Übergang zur Schlußszene des 1. Buches, dem Gespräch zwischen Megaera, die sich noch einmal aufbäumt, und Iustitia, die ihr das Ende Rufins und den Beginn eines glücklichen Zeitalters verkündet.

Das 2. Buch der Rufininvective wird von einer praefatio eingeleitet, die uns Stilicho siegreich von der Schlacht am Alpheus (im Jahre 397) zurückgekehrt und nun seinem Sänger lauschend gegenüber-

sitzend zeigt. Wir werden uns noch zu fragen haben, wie es kommt, daß das gesamte Werk nicht nur eine praefatio am Anfang, sondern auch eine in der Mitte, wo man sie nicht unbedingt erwartet, besitzt.

Am Anfang des 2. Buches wird Stilicho, der Reichswahrer und Beschützer beider Kaiser, dem Verräter Rufin gegenübergestellt, der nicht ruht, den Horden Alarichs die Reichsgrenzen zu öffnen, der die Belagerung Konstantinopels duldet und sich in sadistischer Weise (*immensa voluptas . . . subit*, 78) an den Kriegsgreueln freut. Gleichzeitig brüstet sich Rufin seiner guten Beziehungen zu den Barbaren, die er zur Verwüstung des Balkans rief und zu denen er sich in Barbarenkleidung ins Lager begibt, um über Frieden zu verhandeln. Claudian erklärt nicht, wie beides gleichzeitig möglich ist, er hebt vielmehr hervor, daß beides, die Feinde ins Reich zu locken und die Toga gegen ihre Tracht einzutauschen, nichts anderes bedeutet als der römischen Tradition abtrünnig werden (1-100). Gegen diesen Ausverkauf des Reiches bricht endlich Stilicho auf; wo er sich blicken läßt, weichen die Feinde (101-129). Wenn es ihm gelingt, siegreich bis Konstantinopel vorzurücken, muß Rufin um Herrschaft und Leben fürchten. Er suggeriert dem Kaiser, daß Stilicho und der ganze Westen sich zu seiner Ermordung verschworen habe und daß er die Herrschaft in Konstantinopel usurpieren wolle (130-168). Arcadius läßt sich den Befehl abpressen (*extortas invito principe voces*, 170), daß Stilicho Illyrien verlasse und daß das Heer geteilt werde. Jetzt hätte, wie Claudian seinen Helden, der sich inzwischen kampfbereit in Thessalien eingefunden hat, sagen läßt, jetzt hätte der Tag da sein können, der Rom sowohl die Befreiung von den Barbaren wie von *discordia* und *bellum civile* (235) brächte, wenn nicht der unselige kaiserliche Befehl gekommen wäre, das eine Heer, das *dissociabile corpus* (238) aufzulösen und damit die vielleicht entscheidende Schlacht zu verhindern. Der Widerwille gegen diesen Befehl ist bei Stilicho so groß wie im Heere, gleichwohl gehorcht er ihm loyal (wie Claudian sagt, 202 f.), doch nicht ohne eine ahnungsvolle Andeutung gegen denjenigen, der ihm den Erfolg neidet (*cadat iste minacis invidiae cumulus*, 248). Den an dieser Stelle naheliegenden Seufzer, daß der Fall Konstantinopels nun besiegelt sei, hört man aus seinem Munde nicht, *nec plura locutus flexit iter* (251 f.). Der östliche Heeresteil (*legio disiuncta*, 257) zieht ab, und Rufin glaubt sein Ziel erreicht; er jubelt und sieht sich im Traume bereits als Alleinherrscher. Es folgt, breit ausgemalt, die Abnahme der Truppenparade in Konstantinopel durch Rufin und Arcadius, die Einkreisung und Ermordung Rufins und die

Zerstückelung seiner Leiche (336-453).¹³ Den Abschluß des Gedichtes bildet eine Gerichtsszene im Hades: Rufin wird vor Rhadamanthys geführt, und das letzte Wort ist eine Verfluchungsrede des Unterweltrichters über den Verkäufer des Rechts (*legum venditor*, 500 f.).

Schon zu Anfang des Werkes zeigt sich eine kompositionelle Ungereimtheit. Die praefatio zum 1. Buch sowie dessen erster Abschnitt (1-24) sprechen von der Vernichtung Rufins und der allgemeinen Befreiung, die man im ganzen Reich ob dieses Ereignisses spürt. Der Leser erwartet nun, in dem Gedicht selbst von beidem etwas zu hören. Statt dessen wird er in die unbestimmte Vorgeschichte der Rufinaffäre geführt. Ein Viertel des Gedichtes ist bereits verflossen, als erstmalig der Name Rufins erscheint (91), fast die Hälfte, als dieser überhaupt in Konstantinopel, am Ort seines Wirkens auftritt (176), und erst das letzte Drittel erwähnt einige seiner Untaten, jedoch in der gerafften Form des Überblicks und der Andeutung, als eile der Dichter dem Ende seines Gedichtes zu und nicht als komponiere er die Verbrechen Rufins als — mindestens rhetorische — Voraussetzung zu dessen Ende. Und in der Tat folgt der Dialog zwischen Megaera und Iustitia, mit dem das 1. Buch schließt und in dem Rufin ein schlimmes Ende erst prophezeit wird, ziemlich abrupt auf die Kriegsrüstungen des Helden Stilicho, um ebenso abrupt und folgenlos abzubrechen. Es sei daher die These aufgestellt: Das 1. Buch von Claudians Invektive gegen Rufin, und zwar sein Corpusteil, die Verse 25 bis Ende, ist bereits vor Anfang Dezember 395, dem Zeitpunkt des Eintreffens der Nachricht von Rufins Ermordung in Mailand, verfaßt.

Nur ein Dichter, der bereits eine Invektive gegen das Scheusal Rufin geschrieben oder konzipiert hatte, konnte in dessen gräßlichem Ende eine Bestätigung seiner Aussagen erblicken; nur wer bereits seit längerer Zeit Anklage erhoben hat — und das hat Claudian getan (*iam non . . . queror*, 21 f.) —, kann von einer endlich eingetroffenen Strafe (*tandem Rufini poena*, 20) sprechen.

Ein Schmähdgedicht auf Charakter und Veranlagung Rufins konnte Claudian sinnvollerweise, d.h. wenn es auf irgendein Interesse rechnen sollte, nur zu Lebzeiten des Verhaßten schreiben. Im November / Dezember 395 war Claudian jedoch spätestens mit der Abfassung des Panegyricus auf das dritte Consulat des Honorius beschäftigt, das

¹³ Ob Stilichos Intrige gegen Rufin historisch ist, wie Seeck, Stein und S. Mazzarino (*Stilicone. La crisi imperiale dopo Teodosio*, [Roma 1942], 258 f.), Claudian folgend, annehmen, oder dichterische Erfindung ("pure fiction," Cameron, S. 89, n.1, dem sich E. Demougeot, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 74 [1972], S. 326 anschließt), ist unerheblich angesichts der Charakterisierung von Ruf. II als historischem Epos.

er zu dessen Amtsantritt Anfang Januar 396 vorzutragen hatte.¹⁴ Nach der gängigen Datierung des 1. Buches der Rufininvective hätte er also erst nach diesem Datum mit der Ausarbeitung der Invektive beginnen und das (mit der praefatio) 405 Verse lange Gedicht etwa Mitte 396 vorlegen können. Wen aber im Westen hätte zu dieser Zeit noch eine Polemik gegen den Charakter eines inzwischen gestürzten Ministers und die Vorgeschichte seiner Karriere interessieren können, nicht einmal Stilicho selbst, der sich zudem nach wie vor im Felde befand und so bald nicht in Mailand zurückerwartet werden konnte. Entscheidend dabei ist — und das muß vor allem gegen Camerons Versuch, hieraus ein Datierungskriterium zu gewinnen, betont werden — entscheidend ist, wann Claudian mit Stilichos Rückkehr rechnen konnte, nicht ob und wann dieser tatsächlich im Jahre 396 in Mailand weilte; Ausdrücke aus der praefatio zum 2. Buche wie *immensis . . . succedant otia curis* (13), *longos interrupisse labores . . . tenuem Musis constituisse moram* (15 f.), mit denen Claudian Mitte 397 seinen Helden anredet, lassen nicht vermuten, daß Stilicho "zwischen durch," "gelegentlich" in Mailand war, sondern daß er nach langer, anstrengender Abwesenheit endlich zurückkehrte.¹⁵

Wenn *Ruf. I* in seiner Gesamtheit unter dem in der Einleitung (1-24) dargelegten Gedanken der Wiederherstellung einer Ordnung durch die göttliche Gerechtigkeit konzipiert gewesen wäre, müßte das Ende Rufins als *poena* für seine Verbrechen dargestellt sein, müßte das Gedicht eine Ausführung der in vv. 4-12 und 13-19 formulierten Antinomie sein und folglich mit einer sich in Rufins Untergang manifestierenden *absolutio deorum* schließen. Doch weder das eine noch das andere ist der Fall. Wenn im Hauptteil des Gedichts (25-353) etwas einander gegenübergestellt wird, sind es die Korruption am byzantinischen Hofe und altrömische Einfachheit sowie der Verbrecher Rufin und der Reichswahrer Stilicho, doch nirgends werden in diesem Zusammenhang Zweifel an einer Weltordnung geäußert oder der Glaube an eine göttliche Gerechtigkeit proklamiert, und vollends die breit ausgemalte Furienszene (25-175) läßt nichts von jener Antinomie spüren. Das Ende des Gedichts ist der Aufmarsch beider Parteien; gegenüber dem Reichsverräter Rufin (*Romanas ardet*

¹⁴ Vgl. J. Koch, "Claudian und die Ereignisse der Jahre 395 bis 398," *Rheinisches Museum* 44 (1898), 576 f.; Birt a.a.O. XXIV.

¹⁵ Die Quellen sprechen nicht so eindeutig, wie es Cameron 76 den Ausführungen E. Demougeots, *De l'unité à la division de l'empire romain 395-410* (Paris 1951), S. 162 f., entnehmen zu können glaubt; *cedo equidem* (*Ruf. II. 216*) heißt nicht notwendigerweise, daß Stilicho unmittelbar nach Rufins Verrat nach Italien zurückkehrte, sondern daß er sich Ostrom gegenüber loyal verhält; es bedeutet dasselbe wie *praeceptis obstare timet* (202) und *parcendum est* (218).

prosternere vires, 307) tritt Stilicho zum Kampfe an (*paratur ad bellum Stilicho*, 344 f.); eine Entscheidung fällt bis zum Schluß nicht; der Sieger Stilicho existiert vorerst nur in der Phantasie Claudians. Selbst die *maesta Iustitia* (355 f.), die er diese Vorstellung ausdrücken läßt, erscheint nicht als Verkörperung einer göttlichen Gerechtigkeit, sondern als Verheißerin eines goldenen Zeitalters (*laeto aevo*, 370; vgl. 380 ff.), wie sie bereits zu Beginn als dessen Garantin nicht nur den Furien gegenüber eingeführt war (*aurea aetas*, 51), sondern sich in diese Funktion mit *Concordia*, *Virtus*, *Fides* und *Pietas* teilen mußte.¹⁶

Die Glaubenszweifel, die Claudian in der Einleitung formuliert, kann er in derselben Einleitung erleichtert damit beruhigen, daß die Bestrafung Rufins selbst die Antwort gegeben hat. Die ausgleichende Gerechtigkeit, die er in dieser Bestrafung sieht, drückt er zusätzlich in zwei Sentenzen aus (21-23), um dann mit einem Musenanruf zur Schilderung der Ereignisse überzugehen. Hiernach wird der Leser erwarten, daß die Musen gebeten werden zu erzählen, wie es zu jenem gerechten Ausgleich kam; Claudian bittet sie jedoch darzulegen, *quo tanta lues eruperit ortu* (24), also die Frühgeschichte der unseligen Karriere Rufins. So wenig dieser Musenanruf zu den vorangehenden Aussagen paßt, so gut fügt er sich zu dem folgenden Inferno der Furien, die Rufin selbst als ihr Produkt beanspruchen; *Megaeras meo . . . suscepi gremio* (92 f.) ist eine direkte Antwort auf die Frage *quo . . . eruperit ortu*, und die *lues* wird bereits von 28 f. mit *innumerae pestes Erebi* näher bestimmt.¹⁷

Die praefatio zum 1. Buch jubelt darüber, daß die neue Pythoschlange, Rufin, zur Strecke gebracht ist, das eigentliche Gedicht¹⁸ jedoch beginnt mit dem Ausbruch der Pest als Werk der Furien. Um hier einen Übergang zu erreichen, brauchte Claudian ein Zwischenstück, und das schafft er sich durch ein Prooemium allgemeiner Reflexionen über die Frage, ob sich die gerechten Götter um das Geschick der Menschen kümmern oder ob der Lauf der Welt dem blinden Zufall folgt. Dieser Abschnitt schließt mit dem für ein Prooemium typischen Musenanruf

. . . vos pandite vati,

¹⁶ Die *oppressae leges*, die anfangs (57) nur am Rande erscheinen, fehlen in der Umkehrung dieses Verhältnisses, ([*Megaera*] *gravibus ferri religata catenis*, 377) ganz, obwohl *leges* sonst ein Topos in der Darstellung von *quies* (357) und *pax* sind; vgl. IV *cons. Hon.*, 149 f.; vgl. auch F. Christ, *Die römische Weltherrschaft in der antiken Dichtung* (Stuttgart 1938), 113-15.

¹⁷ Vgl. auch 301-04.

¹⁸ Auch Cameron (67) läßt das "eigentliche" *Ruf.* I erst v. 25 beginnen: "The poem proper opens with a council of Furies in Hades."

Pierides, quo tanta lues eruperit ortu,

und damit ist der Einleitungscharakter des Abschnittes 1-24 als eines Stückes evident, das sich klar von dem übrigen ersten Buch als einer zusammenhängenden und in sich geschlossenen Schmähschrift abtrennen läßt.¹⁹

Wie *Ruf.* I mit einer Furienszene beginnt, so schließt es auch auf der Ebene der Götter. Megaera weist höhnend auf die Ströme von Blut, die Rufin ihr opfert (*praebeat*, 372, nicht *praebuerit*), und Iustitia kündigt erst das gerechte Ende Rufins an, der noch (*nunc*, 370) sein Unwesen treibt, aber bald dem verheißenen Honorius weichen muß, der ein neues Zeitalter bringen wird (369 ff.).

Die Furienszenen hat Claudian offensichtlich Vergils *Aeneis* entlehnt, aber die Unterschiede liegen am Tage. Vergil spricht von Ereignissen, von denen der Leser weiß, daß sie Jahrhunderte zurückliegen, und folglich könnte eine Prophezeiung innerhalb der *Aeneis* nicht in der Weise auf die Gegenwart des Lesers bezogen werden, daß sie als Kriterium zur Datierung des Werkes dienen könnte; dagegen liegen die Dinge grundsätzlich anders, wenn ein Dichter den Aufmarsch der Furien und ihre Prophezeiung von Unheil zur Kennzeichnung gegenwärtiger Ereignisse verwendet. Deutlicher noch ist der Unterschied in der Komposition: bei Vergil verkündet Allecto Ereignisse, die noch innerhalb des Werkes Wirklichkeit werden (VII. 421 ff.), während bei Claudian auf Megaeras Prophezeiung, entgegen der epischen Konvention,²⁰ keine Handlung mehr folgt; auf der anderen Seite enthüllt Jupiter seiner Tochter das künftige Schicksal Roms, das sich in der Zeit zwischen der Aeneishandlung und ihrer Dichtung erfüllt und das Vergil sogar in genaue Zeitabschnitte gliedern kann (I. 261 ff.); Claudian dagegen weiß von einem Ende Rufins noch nichts, er kann die Göttin der Gerechtigkeit nur den unbestimmten Trost aussprechen lassen, daß den Verbrecher Rufin bald eine Strafe ereilen werde.

Es ist bei Claudians ständigem Wechsel im Tempusgebrauch, der offensichtlich den Eindruck einer fortlaufenden Handlung suggerieren soll,²¹ (obwohl sich eine völlige Mißachtung der Chronologie in

¹⁹ Vgl. S. Koster, *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Meisenheim 1980), S. 301: "Auffallend an dieser Einleitung ist, daß entgegen der Gepflogenheit des historischen Epos der Dichter seine eigene Person sprechen läßt." In der Datierungsfrage übernimmt Koster "die wohl plausibelste (!) Datierung, die Birt, Claud. ed. LXVIII und Levy, Rufin. ed. 257 f. vorschlagen."

²⁰ Vgl. G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil* (Princeton 1933), S. 35-43.

²¹ Levy ad I. 220.

Ruf. I nachweisen läßt²²), im Einzelfall nicht leicht zu entscheiden (im Hinblick auf die Feststellung der Abfassungszeit von *Ruf.* I), welche Ereignisse für ihn Gegenwart und welche Vergangenheit sind; vor allem fällt der ausgiebige Gebrauch des Praesens auf, mit dem sich als Praesens historicum vergangene Handlungen vergegenwärtigen lassen. Das gilt jedoch nicht für die Beschreibung von Zuständen im Praesens, z.B. wenn Claudian sagt, daß die Welt vor Rufin zittert und daß im Vergleich mit diesem Scheusal Cinna einst milde und Spartacus bieder erscheinen werden. Hier wäre die Zeitform des durativen Imperfekts oder konstatierenden Praesens ("erscheinen heute milde im Vergleich") am Platze, wenn der Dichter aus der Zeit nach Rufins Ermordung urteilte. Die Dinge sind für ihn noch im Fluß.

Was Claudian von Rufins Taten konkret erwähnt, ist, daß er ihn damit beschäftigt zeigt, die Erfolge der Siege Stilichos in den Jahren 391-2 zunichte zu machen (v. 301-22). Jetzt brennt Rufin darauf, Roms Macht preiszugeben, indem er die Goten zum Aufstand reizt und mit Skythen und Donauvölkern Bündnisse abschließt; er schwächt die Abwehr (314 f.) und verrät das, was seine Greuelthaten übrig gelassen haben, an den Feind (309 f.).

Es ist aufschlußreich zu verfolgen, was Claudian über die Versuche Rufins sagt, die Barbaren auf Reichsgebiet zu locken, um damit innenpolitische Absichten durchzusetzen. Einer dieser Fälle dient (erfolgreich) der Beseitigung des Promotus. Claudian ergeht sich jedoch nur allgemein in einer Aufzählung der Volksstämme, die Rufin zum Verrat benutzt (I. 308 f.); der Name des Promotus wird nicht erwähnt. Den Zeitgenossen Rufins sind die Dinge offenbar bekannt, während sich Claudian fünf Jahre später, im Panegyricus auf das erste Consulat des Stilicho (94 f.), bei der Erzählung desselben Geschehens nicht mehr mit einer Andeutung begnügen kann. Gleichzeitig mußte Claudian die frühere Version der Ereignisse so formulieren, daß Theodosius, unter dessen Herrschaft sie stattfanden, nicht mitbelastet wurde. In einem weiteren Fall, in welchem Rufin sich nach einem militärischen Eingreifen Stilichos wiederum mit den Barbaren verschworen hat, entschuldigt Claudian expressis verbis den Kaiser (*eluso principe*, 320). Auch diesen Fall erzählt er fünf Jahre später ausführlicher. Die Barbarenfrage, an der zuletzt Stilicho selbst scheitern sollte, war so delikat, daß Claudian zu Theodosius' Lebzeiten die Behauptung lieber unterließ, der Kaiser habe mit den schon Gefangenen (!) Bündnisse abgeschlossen (*praeberet foedera captis*, *Stil.* I. 115).²³

²² Cameron, S. 79.

²³ Über weitere Aspekte der "Barbarenfrage" vgl. Cameron, S. 72 f.

In *Ruf.* II ist Rufin tot, und jetzt kann Claudian den Toten mit der vollen Verantwortung für die Barbareneinfälle belasten und ihn beschuldigen, sie veranlaßt zu haben (und gleichzeitig Stilicho vor Vorwürfen dieser Art befreien).²⁴ *Ruf.* II beginnt mit diesem Thema, und zwar in einer Tirade von einer Länge und einem Pathos, als habe Claudian auf den Tod Rufins gewartet, um das Thema Barbareneinfälle einmal breit auszuführen. Jetzt kann er sogar mit einem pikanten Detail aufwarten: Rufin legt bei seinen Besuchen im Lager der Goter Barbarenkleidung an, was nicht nur in römischen Augen unerhört war, sondern durch ein Gesetz des Honorius aus dem Jahre 396 verboten wurde,²⁵ was dem im selben Jahre abgefaßten Gedicht höchste Aktualität verlieh.

Im 1. Buch dagegen weiß Claudian auch sonst wenig Konkretes über Rufin mitzuteilen. Zur Illustration seiner Grausamkeit führt er drei Fälle an, von denen zwei nur Variationen derselben (Tatian-) Affäre sind (als dritter wird in umschreibender Weise die Ludianaffäre berührt); alles andere ist Gemeinplatz, genommen aus dem Reservoir der Invektiventhemen.²⁶ Es hatte sich halt noch nicht viel ereignet, als Claudian das erste Buch schrieb;²⁷ andererseits schrieb er als Zeitgenosse für Zeitgenossen und konnte sich selbst bei dem Wenigen mit Andeutungen begnügen und Details übergehen. Gerade in diesem Punkte liegt der Unterschied zwischen *Ruf.* I und II am Tage. *Ruf.* II ist mit Recht als historisches Epos, *Ruf.* I als rhetorischer *ψόγος* bezeichnet worden; es gipfelt in einer *σύγκρισις* zwischen Rufin und Stilicho (259-300); zeitlos und statisch werden beider Eigenschaften gegenübergestellt; Rufins Taten dienen nur zur Illustration seiner Grausamkeit.

Wenn sich bereits etwas Entscheidendes ereignet hätte, konkret gesprochen, wenn Claudian bei der Abfassung von *Ruf.* I vom Tode Rufins gewußt hätte, hätte er sich nach den genüßlich ausgemalten Furienszenen mit an Sicherheit grenzender Wahrscheinlichkeit nicht

²⁴ Für *Ruf.* II gilt sicher, was Cameron 74 sagt: "And why not [blame] Rufinus—especially now he was dead and unable to defend himself?" Nur lassen sich die knappen Andeutungen über Barbareneinfälle in *Ruf.* I und das Schauergemälde in *Ruf.* II nicht auf denselben literarischen Nenner bringen. Nicht Grausamkeit und Habsucht, wohl aber Verrat des Reiches an die Barbaren war ein glaubhafter Grund, Rufin zu ermorden (so richtig Cameron, S. 70 f.). Das erste ist Hauptthema von *Ruf.* I, von dem zweiten ist *Ruf.* II von Anfang bis Ende durchdrungen.

²⁵ *Cod. Theod.* 14. 10. 1-2.

²⁶ So Cameron, S. 69.

²⁷ Cameron, S. 82: "Claudian was rather short on hard facts." Es ist schwer zu verstehen, wie Cameron trotz dieser richtigen Erkenntnis *Ruf.* I nach dem Tod Rufins datieren kann, wo doch wirklich alle "facts" beisammen sind.

jene Nachricht samt ihren bluttriefenden Details entgehen lassen und sich nicht mit dem blassen Topos *nec moriens vili condetur harena* (371), der nichts anderes als eine Anleihe bei Ovids Ibisgedicht ist,²⁸ als einziger Aussage über ein sonst nicht näher bezeichnetes Ende Rufins begnügt. Er wußte eben von einem solchen Ende noch nichts und nur deshalb konnte er es als ein zukünftiges Ereignis von Iustitia verheißen lassen (368 ff.); ein Gedicht, das in der Einleitung an pointierter Stelle von seinem "Helden" sagt *tandem Rufini poena . . . absolvit deos*, und dessen letzte Aussage über ebendenselben lautet *iam poenas tuus iste dabit* (369), kann nicht als Einheit verfaßt worden sein.²⁹

Die Rede Iustitias über Rufins Ende läßt sich auch nicht als *vaticinium ex eventu* interpretieren; es wäre sonst die Prophezeiung sinnlos

iamque aderit laeto promissus Honorius aevo
nec forti genitore minor nec fratre corusco (372 f.).

Honorius herrscht im Westen eh unangefochten, so daß ein "Kommen zu einem glücklichen Zeitalter" nur eine Steigerung bedeuten kann, nämlich die von der westlichen Propaganda aus dem letzten Willen des Theodosius abgeleitete Herrschaft des Honorius über das ganze Imperium und über seinen älteren und (noch) ranghöheren Bruder. Das hätte Claudian nach der Ermordung Rufins, also etwa Mitte 396, kaum mehr schreiben können, als bekannt war, daß Stilicho doch nicht vermocht hatte, nach Konstantinopel vorzurücken und daß aus den Herrschaftsansprüchen des Honorius über den Osten so bald nicht Wirklichkeit würde. Die Bestätigung hierfür gibt die Erzählung

²⁸ Ov. *Ib.* 168 Merkel *respuet invisum iusta cadaver humus*. Charakteristisch für beide Gedichte ist der Furienapparat, besonders die Vorstellung, daß die Furien den Verhaßten unmittelbar vom Mutterleib in ihre Obhut genommen haben:

Ibis 221 **qui simul impurae matris prolapsus ab alvo . . .**

Ruf. I. 92 f. . . . **quem prima meo de matre cadentem
suscepi gremio.**

²⁹ Vgl. P. L. Schmidt, *Politik und Dichtung in der Panegyrik Claudians* (Konstanz 1976), S. 60, der richtig bemerkt, daß die Prophezeiung Iustitias am Ende von *Ruf.* I nicht "als Epilog dem persönlichen Prolog I 1-24 entsprechen kann." Wenn er jedoch die Abfassung von *Ruf.* I Anfang 396 mit der Hilfskonstruktion ansetzt, Claudian habe das ganze Werk Anfang 396 konzipiert, das 2. Buch als inopportun zunächst verschoben und erst nach den Erfolgen (!) von 397 verfaßt, so läßt er die Frage offen, wie Claudian die künftigen Ereignisse so gut voraussehen konnte, die ihm noch Gelegenheit geben sollten, das Hauptstück seines Stoffes, die Ermordung Rufins, später zu behandeln, so daß er sie in einem Anfang 396 verfaßten Gedicht übergehen konnte.

von Rufins Ermordung in *Ruf.* II, wo eine rechte Siegesstimmung nicht aufkommen will.

Nach der Ermordung Rufins war, wenn irgendwann, für Claudian die Gelegenheit, den Herrschaftsanspruch des Westens zu proklamieren und Stilicho als rechtmäßigen Nachfolger Rufins und Vormund beider Kaiser zu empfehlen. Claudian hat diese Gelegenheit wahrgenommen, und zwar im Panegyricus auf das dritte Consulat des Honorius (151-8. 189), vorgetragen Anfang Januar 396. *Ruf.* I, das bezeichnenderweise keinen Hinweis darauf enthält, erweist sich hierin als vor Rufins Ermordung verfaßt; dagegen nennt die praef. *Ruf.* I, die von der Erlegung des neuen Pytho spricht, Stilicho den Hort der Kaiserbrüder (17), und in *Ruf.* II klingt das Thema zu Beginn an (4-6).

Ruf. I klingt nicht nur mit einem Blick in die Zukunft aus, es macht auch, wie schon angedeutet, nach Form und Inhalt einen nicht abgeschlossenen Eindruck,³⁰ als warte der Dichter noch, daß etwas Erzählenswertes geschehe. Stilicho steht am Ende des Gedichts in ähnlicher Weise bereit zum Kampfe, wie das erste Buch der Eutrop-invektive mit einer Aufforderung an Stilicho zum Kampfe endet. Wer indessen *Ruf.* I erst nach Rufins Tod ansetzt, wie Cameron es tut, der es auch als unvollendet ansieht ("*Ruf.* i . . . is obviously unfinished and looks forward to Bk. ii," S. 79), muß erklären, warum das 2. Buch erst nach mehr als Jahresfrist erschienen ist, und kann sich nicht mit dem Hinweis auf *Eutr.* I begnügen, das erst neun Monate später seine Fortsetzung in *Eutr.* II gefunden hat; denn hier besteht der Unterschied in einem wesentlichen Punkt: von *Eutr.* I wissen wir, daß es etwa ein halbes Jahr vor dem Sturz des Geschmähten rezipiert (und entsprechend früher verfaßt) worden ist.

Die Annahme, daß Claudian seine beiden Invektiven gegen Rufin in geringem Abstand aufeinander folgend verfaßt hätte, würde bedeuten, daß er mit *Ruf.* II, das durch seine Informationsdichte und der Beachtung einer gewissen Chronologie der Ereignisse immerhin den Titel eines historischen Epos beanspruchen darf, seinen ersten, gänzlich anders gearteten Versuch einer Schmähung des toten Gegners als mißlungen betrachtet und damit entwertet hätte—den zweiten übrigens in gewisser Weise auch, der damit als eine wenn auch seriösere, so doch "berichtigte" Ausgabe dessen erschienen wäre, was wegen seines geringen Inhaltes und überspannten Tones nicht die erhoffte Aufmerksamkeit des interessierten Mailänder Hofes gefunden hätte. Es ist kaum vorstellbar, daß ein solcherart mißlungener

³⁰ Vgl. Schmidt a.a.O.: *Ruf.* I "endet mit dem Triumph der Megaera und der noch zu erfüllenden Prophezeiung der Iustitia offensichtlich unfertig."

Versuch nicht von seinem Verfasser selbst kassiert und damit in die Überlieferung seiner politischen Werke gelangt wäre.

Das führt auf das bereits gestellte Problem der zweiten praefatio, das sich nur unter der Annahme löst, daß beide Bücher in beträchtlichem Abstand voneinander rezitiert worden sind, und zwar das erste, bereits seit längerem verfaßte, unmittelbar nach dem Eintreffen der Nachricht vom Tode Rufins (so praef. I. 15 *nunc alio . . . Pythone peremto*), also im Dezember 395, das zweite bei der Rückkehr Stilichos im Sommer 397. Die beiden Gedichte sind also unabhängig voneinander verfaßt und vorgetragen worden und als ursprünglich selbständige Werke hat jedes eine eigene praefatio erhalten, die mit ihnen später in die (wohl von Stilicho verfaßte) Sammlung der Werke Claudians eingegangen sind. Es wäre für einen Dichter, der zur Rückkehr seines Patrons ein Begrüßungsgedicht (als praefatio für die bereits fertige zweite Invektive) verfaßt, ein leichtes gewesen, statt diesem eine neue praefatio für das ganze Werk zu schreiben oder in die vorhandene zur ersten Invektive eine Anrede an Stilicho einzufügen, wenn das zweite Gedicht unmittelbar auf das erste gefolgt wäre und er beide als Einheit empfunden hätte.³¹

Welche Veranlassung aber sollte Claudian überhaupt gehabt haben, selbst nach längerem Zeitabschnitt den Sturz Rufins noch einmal zur Thema zu machen? Seit Mitte 397 mußte es jedem Beobachter der politischen Szene klar sein, daß Eutrop für Stilicho ein noch gefährlicherer Gegner war als sein Vorgänger Rufin, und daß sich jeder publizistische Angriff fortan sinnvollerweise eher gegen Eutrop als gegen einen Minister richtete, dessen Sturz zu dieser Zeit schon Geschichte war. Ein äußerer Anlaß mag darin gesehen werden, daß Claudian mit *Ruf.* I noch keine Gelegenheit gehabt hatte, seinem Gönner Stilicho ein Beispiel seiner Kunst und Nützlichkeit persönlich vorzuführen, da sich dieser Ende des Jahres 395 noch im Felde befand. Einen gewichtigeren Anlaß sieht Cameron 86 f. in dem Umstand, daß Claudian nach Stilichos Mißerfolg des Jahres 397, dem militärischen gegenüber den Goten und dem politischen gegenüber Byzanz, die Notwendigkeit spüren mochte, sein Talent zur Rechtfertigung seines Gönners einzusetzen. Jener Mißerfolg sei kaum zu rechtfertigen gewesen, wohl aber Stilichos Untätigkeit im Herbst 395, deren mittelbares Resultat das Desaster des Jahres 397 war. Damit sei die Möglichkeit einer Rückkehr zum Thema Rufin gegeben gewesen. Diese Annahme ist schon auf den ersten Blick unwahr-

³¹ Die gegenteilige Annahme ist, entgegen S. Döpp, *Zeitgeschichte in Dichtungen Claudians* (Wiesbaden 1980), S. 94, das Unwahrscheinliche und deshalb des Beweises bedürftig.

scheinlich. Wenn Stilichos größeres Versagen von 397 schon tatsächlich vorlag, wäre es Aufgabe seines Propagandisten gewesen, dieses zu verteidigen und Stilichos neuen Kontrahenten Eutrop zu schmähen und nicht auf den schon halb vergessenen und durch die neuen, gravierenden Ereignisse verblaßten Mißerfolg von 395 zurückzugreifen. Entscheidend aber scheint mir folgendes Argument. Wenn *Ruf. II* von den Ereignissen des Jahres 397 ablenken soll, wäre es höchst ungeschickt, mit der Praefatio die Aufmerksamkeit des Hörers auf ebendieselben Ereignisse zu lenken und dann im ganzen übrigen Werk von der Kampagne von 395 zu sprechen³² und damit erst recht zu zeigen, daß man sich scheut, ein aktuelles und brisantes Thema anzugreifen. Bereits aus der Tatsache, daß Praef. *Ruf. II* eine *ad hoc* komponierte Grußadresse an den soeben heimgekehrten Stilicho ist, die mit dem Inhalt des Folgenden nichts zu tun hat, geht hervor, daß *Ruf. II* schon von Stilichos Rückkehr verfaßt und nur seine Rezitation bis zu diesem Zeitpunkt aufgeschoben war. Auch der Gang der politischen Ereignisse verbietet, die Abfassung der zweiten Rufinivektive auf den Spätsommer 397, die kurze Zeit der Anwesenheit Stilichos bei Hofe vor der Mobilmachung zum Feldzug gegen Gildo, anzusetzen. Eine solche Annahme müßte nämlich von der Voraussetzung ausgehen, daß das, was sich zwischen jenem Datum und der Abreise Stilichos im März desselben Jahres³³ in der östlichen Reichshälfte ereignet hat, in Mailand vor Stilichos Rückkehr nicht nur in seinem ganzen Ausmaß und seiner politischen Bedeutung bekannt gewesen und interpretiert worden wäre, sondern darüber hinaus Claudian noch genügend Zeit gelassen hätte, sein publizistisches Programm darauf abzustellen und bis zur Rückkehr seines Patrons ein Werk von 527 Hexametern über einen Stoff zu produzieren, der seinem Gedächtnis und seiner Aufmerksamkeit zu diesem Zeitpunkt bereits fernegelegen haben dürfte. Daß jene Voraussetzungen nicht bestanden haben, geht daraus hervor, daß schon die zeitgenössischen Quellen in Darstellung und Wertung der Ereignisse des Sommers 397 divergieren, d.h. letztlich auch nichts Genaueres wissen.³⁴ Wir erhalten weder eindeutigen Aufschluß über den Grund, warum Stilicho die eingeschlossenen Goten—sofern er sie tatsächlich eingeschlossen hatte—wieder hat abziehen lassen, noch über das Motiv, aus dem heraus der Senat von Konstantinopel auf Antrag Eutrops

³² Einzig *Ruf. II.* 186-91 wird ein Ausblick auf die Ereignisse des Jahres 396 gegeben.

³³ Vgl. Seeck 5, *Anhang* S. 553 zu 280. 16.

³⁴ Die modernen Darstellungen sind ein Abbild dieses Zustandes; man vergleiche Seeck 5, S. 280 f. mit Stein, S. 354 f.

Stilicho zum *hostis publicus* erklärte.³⁵ Hier wäre es, wenn die Verhängung der Reichsacht über seinen Gönner Mitte 397 in Mailand bekannt gewesen wäre, für Claudian unausweichlich gewesen, wenn er schon Stilicho zu diesem Zeitpunkt nicht hätte preisen können, zumindest mit einem Pamphlet gegen Eutrop dessen politische Glaubwürdigkeit zu zerstören. Die Tatsache, daß Claudians erster publizistischer Angriff auf Eutrop im Jahre 399 erfolgte, zeigt jedoch, wie lange der Hofdichter bisweilen brauchte, um sich der politischen Ereignisse geistig zu bemächtigen, d.h. sie für seine propagandistischen Zwecke brauchbar zu machen.³⁶ Auch die Art und Weise, wie er in *Ruf.* II seinen Stoff nach allen Regeln der Kunst eines mit Elementen der Invektive versetzten historischen Epos bewältigt,³⁷ widerspricht der Annahme, er habe dieses Gedicht, als unrühmliche Nachrichten über Stilicho—oder gar erst mit ihm selbst³⁸—am Hofe eintrafen, eilends zu dessen Entlastung verfaßt. *Ruf.* II lag also Mitte 397 bereits vor; demnach liegt seine Abfassung zwischen Anfang 396 und Anfang 397. Was aber dürfte Claudian bewogen haben, zu dieser Zeit noch einmal das Thema Rufin aufzugreifen?

Es hatte sich bald gezeigt, daß mit dem Sturze Rufins weder die Reichseinheit wiederhergestellt noch—was wichtiger und dringender erschien—die Gotengefahr beseitigt war. Da aber Stilicho einerseits als Vandale und Exponent der barbarenfreundlichen Partei über gute Beziehungen zu den Goten verfügte, andererseits die Truppen Alarichs in Thessalien hatte ziehen lassen, was die Verwüstung Griechenlands zur Folge hatte, mußte der Verdacht aufkommen, daß Stilicho, nicht Rufin, mit den Barbaren gemeinsame Sache machte.³⁹ Diesen Verdacht von Stilicho nehmen hieß gleichzeitig, ihn Rufin aufbürden und seinen diplomatischen Verkehr mit den Barbaren als Hochverrat darzustellen; hieß gleichzeitig, das Ende Rufins zum Werke Stilichos und zu einer notwendigen und gerechten Tat zu erklären. Jetzt konnte es nicht mehr mit Schmähung und Verunglimpfung Rufins sein Bewenden haben, jetzt bedurfte es, um den Hörer zu überzeugen, der Darlegung der historischen Fakten, freilich nicht

³⁵ Claud. *Stil.* I. 277 f.; Pollent. 517; Zos. V. 11; Oros. VII. 36. 2; 37. 2; man vergleiche Demougeot, S. 176 (der Cameron 86 sich anschließt) mit Stein a.a.O. Seeck schweigt über diesen Punkt.

³⁶ Über die anfängliche Fehleinschätzung Eutrops durch den weströmischen Hof vgl. Claud. *Eutr.* II. 543-50.

³⁷ Vgl. Cameron, S. 85 f. Die Darstellung von Rufins Ende nennt er "a dramatic masterpiece" (S. 89).

³⁸ Koch 611 denkt, im Anschluß an Claud. *Stil.* I. 300 ff., an Stilichos eilige Rückkehr aus Griechenland noch vor der Rückkehr des Heeres.

³⁹ Vgl. Cameron, S. 85-87.

um zu zeigen, wie es wirklich gewesen ist, sondern wie es sich für den Propagandisten Stilichos darstellte. Das Ergebnis ist *Ruf.* II, das sich nicht nur dadurch von *Ruf.* I unterscheidet, daß Stilichos Untätigkeit gegenüber den Barbaren als Loyalität zum Kaiser (II. 202-18) und Rufins Unterhandlungen mit ihnen als Illoyalität und Verrat hingestellt werden (II. 314, 342, 383), sondern auch dadurch daß Rufin selbst unter einem anderen Aspekt erscheint: er ist jetzt nicht mehr das Produkt der Höllennächte, dem Megaera Instruktionen gibt, wie man das Reich vernichtet (I. 140-61), und der dem Befehl der Furien folgt (I. 120-2), sondern der aus eigenem Entschluß handelt und allein die Verantwortung trägt (II. 7-21; *stimulator Martis*, 501).

Universität Mannheim

10

Byzantina Varia

GERALD M. BROWNE

1) Ad Cecaumeni *Strategicon* 33

πληροφορήθητι γὰρ ὅτι ὁ δειλιάσας οὐδὲ φυγεῖν δύναται κατὰ τὸν ψαλμωδόν· φησὶν γὰρ “ἀπώλετο φυγεῖν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.”

Vide quae scripsit Wilson¹ ad loc.: “The reference to the Psalms cannot be traced, and the sense is obscure; editors have suggested the emendation φυγῶν.”² maluerim φυγή: cf. Ps. 141(142):5 ἀπώλετο φυγὴ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.

2) Ad Timarionem 5

ὁλκὸν γὰρ ἦν ἰδέσθαι σκηνῶν, ἐπὶ ποσὶ ταῖς παρηρτημέναις ἐγκαρσίαις ὥσπερ ἐπερειδόμενον.³

Ut pristina verborum concinnitas redintegretur, puto ὥσπερ transponendum esse, videlicet: <ὥσπερ> ἐπὶ ποσὶ ταῖς παρηρτημέναις ἐγκαρσίαις {ὥσπερ} ἐπερειδόμενον (=ἐπὶ ταῖς παρ. ἐγκαρσίαις ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ποσὶ ἐπερειδόμενον); cf. Heliodori *Aethiopica* VII. 7. 7 ὥσπερ βέλει τῷ ῥήματι βληθείς (=τῷ ῥήματι ὥσπερ βέλει βληθείς) et vide quae de hoc idiomate scripsi in *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 12 (1971), pp. 60-61. forsitan ob homoeoarchon (ἐπὶ . . . ἐπερειδόμενον) corruptela in textum irrepsit.

Urbanae, Ill.

¹ Nigel G. Wilson, *An Anthology of Byzantine Prose* (Berolini et Novi Eboraci 1971), p. 85 ad 36.

² Cf. B. Wassiliewsky et V. Jernstedt, *Cecaumeni Strategicon et incerti scriptoris De officiis regis libellus* (Petropoli 1896), p. 12 ad 20 sq.: “φυγῶν? ceterum de psalmodo videtur falli.”

³ Vd. Wilson, op. cit. 114. 71-72 et adnot. ad loc.: “ἐπὶ Hase: ὑπὸ ms.”

11

Alcestis Barcinonensis

MIROSLAV MARCOVICH

urbis Urbanae conlegis urbanis

1. The Papyrus

The long P. Barcinonensis, Inv. Nos. 158ab, 159ab, 160ab, 161a (saec. IV²), comprises a fascinating late Latin poem of 122 hexameters (the original had at least 125 lines) dealing with the heroic death of Alcestis to save the life of her husband Admetus. The text of the poem spreads over six closely written pages of the papyrus (125 × 103 mm), with four lines on the seventh page. The script is early half-uncial with cursive elements, probably belonging to the second half of the fourth century. These four papyrus leaves were later incorporated into a *codex mixtus* (the property of the Foundation *Sant Lluc Evangelista* at Barcelona), as its fols. 33-36. Our *Alcestis* is preceded in the codex by Cicero's *Catilinarians* 1 and 2 (fols. 1-24a); by a Latin *Psalmus Responsorius* (fols. 24b-28a); and by a Greek liturgical text (fols. 29b-32). The five papyrus leaves containing the *Psalmus Responsorius* are briefly described by E. A. Lowe, as No. 1782 of the *Supplement* to his *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (Oxford 1971), p. 32. Lowe dated the script of the Psalm to saec. IV². This is valid for the text of our *Alcestis* as well, since it is copied by the same scribe.

Dr. R. Roca-Puig deserves the gratitude of scholars for having published first the Barcelona Psalm (Barcelona 1965), then the *Catilinarians* 1 and 2 (Barcelona 1977), and now *Alcestis* as well (*Alcestis. Hexàmetres Llatins*, Barcelona 1982). The papyrus is preserved in excellent condition: it shows no physical damage, and is written

in a relatively readable hand. The papyrus patch pasted on p. 158a, lines 12-16, does not affect legibility. The text of the poem is copied as if it were prose, all in one breath, with only an occasional dot marking the end of a line.

However, what makes the text difficult to read and understand is its scribe. Doubtless he was copying from a poor exemplar, plagued with textual corruptions and intrusive glosses. For example, in v. 3 of the poem the unmetrical gloss *Apollo* has ousted the original reading *Arcitenens* (if my guess is correct), and another explanatory gloss *Apollo* still stands above the word *Lauripotens* of v. 1. In line 13, the word *inquit* seems to refer to the marginal gloss: *Apollo inquit*, as does the *inquit* of line 72: *Alcestis inquit*. In line 124 there is a blank space of three letters (*mea*) for a word illegible in the exemplar.

The scribe himself, however, is the main culprit. He is (1) illiterate, (2) negligent, and, even worse, (3) he sometimes assumes the role of a *redactor*, taking the liberty of deliberately changing the text.

(1) As for the scribe's illiteracy, Lowe's remark remains valid for the text of *Alcestis* as well: ". . . the scribe was unused to copying Latin." ". . . by a scribe who did not quite understand what he was copying." There seems to be more to it than this. Our scribe apparently knew the spoken Vulgar Latin, but not enough of the classical Latin of the poem he was copying. Both the phonology and morphology of our text seem to reflect a struggle between vulgar and classical forms. Consider these examples: 2 *tuus* for *tuo*, and 59 *locus* for *loco*; 9 *famolum*, and 109 *famolos*; 10 *post crimine*, and 76 *post funere nostro*; 24 *requeret* (for *requirit*), 67 *perdedit* . . . *perdedit*; 96 *moreor*, and 123 *rapeor*; 116 *desponit*; 124 *claudet* (for *claudit*); 43 *dante* (for *ante*); 41 *tumulus* (for *tumulos*), 78 *atrus* (for *atros*), 110 *pictusque toros*; 116 *arsurusque omnes*; 45 *fletus* for *fletu*, 118 *manos* for *manu*; 47 *materna cernere morte*; 48 *ubira*; 50 *consumad*; 55 *urbis* for *orbis*; 61 *fratre* for *fratris*; 67 *Alpea* for *Althaea*, and 113 *palsama*; 117 *ratura*; 119 *oculos* for *oculis*; 121 *gremio* for *gremium*. A redundant final *-m* also witnesses to the loss of declensions: 2 *quem* (for *-que*); 13 *mors vicinam*; 38 *regnam dedi tibi*; 39 *ullam* (for *una*); 45 *nec pietatem* . . . *vincitur*; 52 *aeternam sede* (for *terrena sede*); 84 *vestigiam*.

(2) The scribe's negligence is reflected in such errors as: *genitum* (18) or *genitur* (26 and 29) for *genitor*; 24 *lacrimarum causa* for *lacrimis* <*quae*> *causa*; 26 *vides* for *dies* (this may have stood in his exemplar as *diues*; compare 42 *diu'm* for *diem*); 31 *digneos natosque* for *digneris natoque*; 36 *sicut suum* for *si quod sum*; 59 *se* for *res* (compare 90 [[*de*]]*re^{de}unt*); 72 *niquid* for *neci*; 81 *tradere pulcris* for *trade sepulcris*; 87 *digna retinere* for *dignare tenere*; 124 *sembra soporem* (Spanish?) for *membra sopore*.

(3) Deliberate attempts by the scribe to correct his exemplar, however, abound: 1 *doli* for *Deli*(*e*) and *piant* for *P*(*a*)*ean*; 5 *relinquam* (for *-ant*) and 80 *recedam* (for *-at*); 6 *quando* (from v. 3) *luit* for *cum fugit* (or *cum fluxit*); 8 *vitam* (for *regna*) induced by 7 *vita*, and 37 *vitam* (for *vis iam*) induced by 37 *vita*; 50 *meae* for *mihi*; perhaps 52 *aeternam* for *terrena*; 68 *colligit illa cruentus* for *colligit ilia cruda*. Here belong also the unwarranted additions to the text, such as: 9 *si* [*non*] *te colui*; 41 [*con*]cessisse[*se*]m; 69 [*pre*]cedunt; 87 f. [*neve*] . . . *nec*; 90 *tecum* [*sub nocte*] *iacebo*, inspired by 86 *tecum sub nocte iacere*; 100 *si tibi* (for *me*) *dissimiles* [*hoc*].

As a consequence, the P. Barcinonensis poses major problems of reading and interpretation. Dr. Roca-Puig has provided scholars with an accurate transcript of the papyrus, along with reasonably clear photographs. His attempt at reconstruction of the original poem, however, is far from satisfactory, since it fails to produce credible Latin poetry. After the publication of the papyrus (18 October 1982), three attempts at recovering the original poem were undertaken at the same time and independently of each other: one by Wolfgang Dieter Lebek at Cologne; another by a team of Oxford scholars (P. J. Parsons, R. G. M. Nisbet, G. O. Hutchinson); a third by myself (in the spring of 1983). The task was not easy. To quote only my Oxford colleagues: "Everything suggests an uncomprehending scribe with a difficult exemplar: the copy abounds in elementary errors and serious corruptions."

In the fall of 1983, "the provisional text" of *Alcestis* prepared by Lebek and the Oxonienses appeared (*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 53 [1983], pp. 1-29 and 31-36, respectively). I then revised my reconstruction of the poem so as to incorporate their impressive scholarship wherever convincing enough. The result is the present tentative edition of the poem. As was to be expected, elementary scribal errors have found identical solutions in all three independent attempts. But in the case of the more serious corruptions differences in reading and interpretation persist. Thus I offer a different reading from either Lebek or the Oxonienses in the following lines: 2 *lectas*; 3 (Arcitenens); 6 *cum fu*(*g*)*it*; 7 *ni*; 8 (*sit*(*n*)) and (*pallida regna*?); 37 *minimam vi tollere vi*(*s*) *iam*?; 39 (vi)ta quia; 41 (g)rate cessissem (nato); 50 *mihi lucis*; 52 *ter*(*r*)*ena sede*; 55 *nascitur, ac nobis iteratus fingitur orbis*; 56 *late*: (ibi) *te*; 59 *quo* (r)es; 62 (T)ita(nu)m ex arte perisse; 67 *Alt*(ha)ea (g)natum; 68 *dum colligit ilia cruda*; 74 *Admete, (ad)ventura*; 80 *dum*; 95 *ex te*; 99 *prodat, et* (h)eu flentes; 100 *si me dissimules, si*; 101 *paulum ad te veni*(at) . . .; 118 *tractavitque manu*. In addition, while Lebek recognizes no textual lacunas at all, and the Oxonienses

one lacuna (hiding in *paones* of P after line 110), I assume two textual lacunas—after line 110, and after line 101, hiding in *ueniet*, and containing the apodosis to the clause of 100 f.: *Si me dissimules, si non mea dulcis imago / paulum ad te veni(at)*.

2. The Content of the Poem

The *Alcestis Barcinonensis* belongs to the genre of late Latin exercises in verse composition, ethopoeia, rhetoric, and mythological erudition. The *Alceste* of the *Anthologia Latina* (No. 15; 162 hexameters) is its closest parallel. Dracontius' *Hylas* and *Orestis Tragoedia* belong to the same genre. But what a difference between the *Alceste* of the A.L. and our *Alcestis*! The former is basically a Vergilian cento, while the latter is the product of an inspired, skilled and learned poet. To quote again my Oxford colleagues: "*Alceste* . . . : a flaccid pastiche which points up the merits of the Barcelona bard." Nevertheless, the *Alceste* is of relevance for the understanding of our poem (and has been taken into consideration in my *Quellenapparat* wherever appropriate).

In brief, once restored to its pristine beauty, the Barcelona *Alcestis* proves to be a skillful and convincing late Latin poem. *Pace* Hutchinson, it seems to be complete. It opens with a grandiloquent invocation of Apollo by Admetus; it closes with Alcestis' death (just like the *Alceste* of A.L.). The poem falls easily into four parts, arranged climactically:

- (1) Admetus asks and Apollo answers (1-20);
- (2) Admetus is rejected by his father and mother (21-70);
- (3) The *rhesis* of Alcestis (71-103);
- (4) Alcestis' death (104-124).

In each one of the four parts the poet displays a sophistication which bears testimony to his aspiration to the status of *poeta doctus*.

Lines 1-20

Admetus invokes Apollo, eager to learn his exact day of death. In his *epiclesis*, he employs no less than six epithets for the invoked divinity, and takes good care to remind Apollo that he "owes him one" (*do, ut des*: 9-11; *si te colui . . . succepi . . . accepi iussi(que)*). The speaker identifies himself with 4 *Admeti fatalia fila*. It is worth pointing out that Admetus draws a distinction between his spirit (6 *animus*) and his very being (5 *ego*). After his death, Admetus is sure his spirit will ascend to "the starry sphere" (6 *siderea(s) animus cum fu(g)it in auras*). What he does not know, however, is where his own self will go—to Hades (8) or, say, to the Islands of the Blessed.

Apollo obliges his ex-master by revealing that his day of death is imminent: Admetus must approach the realm of Hades. However, if a substitute for him can be found (his father, mother, wife, or sons), Admetus' death may be postponed. This is acceptable both to the Fates and to Apollo (27 ff.). Here our poet employs the motif expressed in 17, *tu poteris posthac alieno vivere fato*. That is to say, the remaining years allotted to the life of a relative may be transferred to the account of Admetus. The motif is known from Ovid, *Met.* VII. 168 (Jason to Medea): *deme meis annis et demptos adde parenti* (sc. Aesoni); Prop. IV. 11. 95 (our poet knew the *regina elegiarum*, cf. his v. 93); Tibull. I. 6. 63 f.¹

Lines 21-70.

Both father and mother categorically refuse to give up their lives for the son. Here the poet takes care to denigrate both the father and the mother, enabling him to extol and contrast Alcestis' noble *ethos*. The father is an anti-father (32 *hic genitor, non ut genitor*), and the mother is depicted as *nocens, improba* and *improperans* (45 f.). The father adduces two arguments in his favor: (1) "I have already given my kingdom along with my court to you. What else do you want?" and (2) "Had you the power of restoring my life after death, I would yield to your wish, but you do not have such power."

The mother's rhetoric is more sophisticated (46-70). She adduces five different arguments for her refusal.

- (1) It is a *crime* for a son (hence 47, *tu, scelerate, potes . . . ?*) to cause the destruction on a pyre of his mother's womb and breast, which had given him life in the first place.
- (2) "I would gladly give my life for my son, were I sure that afterwards he would live on earth *forever*. But this is not the case."
- (3) The Stoic argument, "Death begins with birth": 53 *Cur metui(s) mortem, cui nascimur?* Cf. Seneca, *De consolatione ad Marciam* 10. 5, and other similar literature.²
- (4) "It would be a sacrilege for me to interfere with the decree of Fate" (64 *Cur ego de nato doleam, quem fata reposcunt?*).
- (5) Finally, the inevitable set of *exempla priorum* (as old as *Iliad* V. 385-404). Even gods die (temporarily, but die): Zeus, Dionysus, Demeter, Aphrodite (60-64). "Even mothers of nobler birth than mine have lost their sons: Diomedes, Agave, Althaea, Ino, Procne. Why should I be exempt?" (65-68).

¹ Cf. Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (Bloomington 1966²), E165; D1855.2; T211.1.

² Lebek rightly refers to R. Kassel, *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsollationsliteratur, Zetemata* 18 (München 1958).

Already v. 62 *Bacc(h)um fama refert (T)ita(nu)m ex arte perisse* (cf. Clement, *Protr.* 17. 2; Arnob., *Adv. nat.* 5. 19) displays mythological erudition. But our poet also here draws two rare motifs from folklore. The first is at 54 f.: *ubi barbarus ales / nascitur, ac nobis iteratus fingitur orbis*. The birth of the strange, legendary bird the phoenix in the Orient is considered by mankind as the beginning of a new world era. This hints either at the Egyptian Sothis period of 1461 solar years, or at the *magnus annus* of 1000 or 500 years (Herodotus II. 73; Pliny, *N.H.* X. 5; XXIX. 29; Tacitus, *Ann.* VI. 28, and others). The second occurs at 59: *non est terra loco, quo (r)es generaverat ante*, which I take to be a clumsy way of saying, "the aging Mother Earth is no longer in the same shape or condition in which she was when creating all these things."³

Lines 71-103.

Alcestis adduces three reasons why she wants to sacrifice her life for her husband. In the first place, this is dictated by her sense of duty — *pietas* (75). *Pietas* is the key word of the entire poem. We have already learned (45) that Admetus' mother does not possess such *pietas* (*nec pietate, nocens, nec vincitur improba fletu*). Alcestis outdoes both parents in *pietas* (75). In the memory of posterity she will live forever as a "pious wife" (78, *et coniux pia semper ero*). Moreover, she will remain a faithful mother, caring for her children *even in her grave* (99, *matris pia . . . umbra*). And her final injunction addressed to her husband comprises the emphatic phrase: *et tu pro coniuge cara / discemori, de m(e) discememplu(m) pietatis* (102 f.), ". . . and you too learn to die for your (new) wife (if need be); learn from my example what a real sense of duty is." The phrase *pro coniuge cara* refers to Admetus' future, second wife; the one referred to at 84 f. as *coniux / carior*, and at 98 as the proverbial stepmother (*noverca*). Lebek, however, keeps the text of P: *et tu pro coniuge caro*, taking *tu* to be addressed to a young and married female reader, as a kind of *parabasis* (see his Commentary, p. 27). But this would destroy the close unity of the poem (nor is it any better to take *tu* as referring to Admetus' future wife). A scribe who was able to write *futuri* for *futura* (v. 7), *car* for *cara* (v. 18), *quae* for *qui* (v. 20), *lacrimum* for *lacrimas* or *lacrimam* (v.

³ Lebek takes *est* to mean "eats," and reads line 59 as follows: *Non est terra locos, quos egeneraverat ante?* ("Verschlingt nicht die Erde die Orte, die sie zuvor hervorgebracht hatte?"; with reference to Pliny, *N.H.* II. 205 *ipsa se comest terra . . .*). But such a seismic activity of the earth is not a self-evident truth; there is no Latin word *egenerare*; and the most natural sense of *est* is "is" (ignoring a strained interpretation of *loci* as "mountains"). In their turn, the Oxonienses read: *Non est terra loco quo se generaverat ante*. What can this mean? Does it mean that Mother Earth has her own birthplace, where she had created herself?

44), *vadam* for *vadum* (v. 63), is also able to write *caro* for *cara* in 102.

Alcestis' second reason for dying for her husband is that her glorious feat will be remembered by posterity forever (76-78); and her third reason is that by dying before her husband she will be spared a widow's wretched life of everlasting mourning (78-81).

Alcestis' last request to her husband (83-103) contains three significant elements. (1) She demands to be kept in lasting memory by her husband (83-92). (2) She entrusts to him the care of their sons (93-99). (3) Finally, she issues a *threat* in case he disobeys her last wish and consigns his dead wife to total oblivion (100-103). Each one of these three elements is intriguing.

(1) Euripides' Alcestis entreats Admetus *not* to remarry. Her main concern is her children, and she does not want them to have an evil stepmother (305, καὶ μὴ 'πιγήμεν τοῖσδε μητρὶαν τέκνοις; her entire request is worth study, 299-310). So does the *Alceste* of the *Latin Anthology* (125 f.; 127 f.). Our Alcestis, however, allows Admetus to remarry (84 *coniux*; 98 *novercae*; 102 *coniuge*). If one asks why our poet has changed the traditional myth, my answer would be: because Cornelia does not request Paullus not to remarry either (Propertius IV. 11. 85-90). Otherwise neither poet would have been able to exploit the touching motif of the traditional stepmother (*Alceste* 98 f.; Propertius IV. 11. 86 ff.). Hear the voice of Euripides (*Alc.* 309-10):

ἐχθρὰ γὰρ ἡ 'πιούσα μητρὶαν τέκνοις
τοῖς πρόσθ', ἐχίδνης οὐδὲν ἡπιωτέρα.

However, his wild imagination launches our poet into troubled waters. First, his Alcestis urges her husband not to love his second wife as dearly as he did his first wife: *ne post mea fata / dulcior ulla tibi, vestigia ne mea coniux / carior ista legat* (83-85). I am unable to parallel this, but one may easily understand such a request in view of Alcestis' noble sacrifice for her husband. Her next request, however, takes us by surprise. Alcestis asks her husband literally (85, *nec nomine tantum*) to sleep with her ghost once she is dead (85-88 and 90). One is reminded at once of the myth of Laodamia, sleeping with the *simulacrum aereum* of her beloved and deceased husband Protesilaus (Hyginus, *Fab.* 104. 1; Apollodor., *Epitome* 3. 30; Eustath. ad *Iliad.* II. 701, p. 325. 25 ff.). But did our poet know this rather recondite myth? A closer source of his inspiration is to be seen again in the *regina elegiarum* (Prop. IV. 11. 81-84). However, our poet seems to combine the shade of Cornelia with the ghost of Cynthia (Prop. IV.

7). Consider the similarity between *Alcestis* 90, *Si redeunt umbrae, veniam tecum<que> iacebo*, and Propertius IV. 7. 3-4, *Cynthia namque meo visa est incumbere fulcro, / . . . nuper humata*; IV. 7. 89, *nocte vagae ferimur, nox clausas liberat umbras*.

(2) With *Alcestis*' second request (93, *Ante omnes commendo tibi pia pignora natos*), our poet follows the poet of the *Alcesta* in his centonic zeal: Prop. IV. 11. 73, *Nunc tibi commendo communia pignora natos*. He also may prove my assumption correct that Propertius IV. 7 and IV. 11 is the main source of his inspiration for lines 83-99. However, here too he borrows a motif from folklore: the dead mother takes care of her orphans even from the grave (99, *(ne) . . . / . . . <h>eu flentes matris pia vindicet umbra*).⁴

(3) The sanction and revenge of the forgotten wife, I assume, is lost in the lacuna following the words of 100 f.: "And if you neglect me, if the sweet image of me does not come to your mind from time to time . . ." The most natural assumption seems to be that the ghost of the forgotten *Alcestis* would pursue the unmindful husband just as a Fury does. His source of inspiration might have been *Aeneid* IV. 384-86: *Sequar atris ignibus absens* (sc. *Dido Aeneas*) / *et, cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus, / omnibus umbra locis adero* (cf. 520 f.; elsewhere our poet makes use of the diction of *Aeneid* IV).

Lines 104-124.

This final passage briefly describes *Alcestis*' preparations for her own pyre, and her death. The last night of her life she spends awake (104-07), just as *Dido* does (*Aeneid* IV. 522 f. and 529 f.). She repeatedly reminds her husband and children dutifully to mourn their deceased wife and mother; she takes care of her slaves in her will (if this is what the phrase 109 *disponit famulos* means); and, most of all, she gives orders concerning her bier and pyre. The poet pays special attention to exotic spices, perfumes, frankincense, saffron-essence, balsam, amomum-powder, and cinnamon, to be burnt on the pyre along with the young woman. I wonder why, unless this too is a display of erudition (e.g. the belief that *amomum* is derived from birds' nests: 114, *ereptum nido praecidit pulver amomi*: cf. Herodotus III. 111; Pliny, *N.H.* XII. 85).

A personified *Hora* (117), *Alcestis*' Hour of death (cf. *TLL* VI.

⁴ Compare Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index* E221.2.1; E323.2. H. Bächtold-Stäubli, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens* VI (1934-35), p. 697; J. Bolte und G. Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm* I (Leipzig 1913, repr. Hildesheim 1963), p. 96 (ad Grimm, Nos. 11 and 13).—Here again the *regina elegiarum* is at hand: Prop. IV. 11. 74 *haec cura* (sc. *natorum*) *et cineri spirat inusta meo*.

2963. 30-57), approaches the young woman to claim her prey. She just touches her with her cold hand (118, *tractavitque manu*), if my reading is correct (cf. 88 *tractare manu*, and Statius, *Silvae* V. 1. 88). Numbness starts taking hold of her every limb. Alcestis dies slowly, as one who has drunk hemlock. She can watch her fingernails growing blue, her freezing feet becoming heavy with cold. A fleeting shadow, woman no longer (if this is what the puzzling borrowing from *Aeneid* X. 656 and Silius XVII. 644, *fugientis imago*, means), she seeks her last refuge in her husband's lap (121). Finally, she utters her last words (122 "*Dulcissime coniux . . .*"), and slips into the eternal slumber of death (124).

3. The Diction

The poet of the *Alcestis* is building upon the best traditions of Latin poetry (notably, Vergil, Propertius, Ovid, Silius Italicus, Statius). His metrics are correct (notice, however, 6 *edoce* as a dactyl, and 26 *para* as a dibrach); his colometry is convincing enough for a late Latin poem. The flow of words is natural, and our poet has succeeded in producing a lively, informal, and pleasing Ovidian Latin. This is achieved in the first place by a frequent employment of *anaphora*: 3 *da . . . da*; 5 *quae . . . qui*<d>; 10 f. / *sucepi . . . / accepi*; 18 *cum . . . cum*; 27 *hoc . . . hoc*; 29 *tu . . . tu*; 29 f. *si . . . si*; 32 *hic genitor, non ut genitor*; 45 *nec . . . nec*; 47 f. / *tu . . . / tu*; 50 f. *hostis . . . / hostis*; 54 *quo . . . quo*; 56 *illic . . . <ibi>*; 57 *nihil . . . nihil*; 64 f. / *cur . . . / cur*; 65 *plangam . . . planxere*; 67 *perdidit . . . perdidit*; 72 *me, <me> . . . me*; *trade . . . trade*; 74 *pro coniuge coniux /*; 75 f. / *si . . . / si*; 75 *vinco . . . vinco*; 81 f. *me . . . / me*; 83 f. *ne . . . ne*; 86 *me . . . meque*; 93 f. *pignora . . . / pignora*; 100 *si . . . si*; 103 *disce . . . disce*; 109 *disponit . . . conponit*; 123 *venit . . . venit*.

The same preference for a picturesque and colloquial *anaphora*, however, turns to be occasionally a *bathos* in our poet's style. Some of his repetitions are disturbing. It is to no avail that my Oxford colleagues try to get rid of some of them (notably, 27 *hoc Parcae docuere nefas*; 113 *destringit*). I think this time the poet is to blame, not the scribe. Consider these repetitions: 16 *possit* ("who may have the heart") : 17 *poteris* ("you would be allowed to"); 25 *edocet* : 27 *docuere* : 28 *edocuit*; 72 *me . . . trade sepulcris /* : 81 *me trade sepulcris /*. Incidentally, the synonym *tumulus* appears too often for one poem (in 20; 30; 41; 48), in addition to 60 *tumulatus* and 69 *contumulantur*. 86 *tecum sub nocte iacere* : 90 *veniam tecum<que> iacebo*; 107 *peritura videbat /* : 119 *moritura notabat /*; 109 *disponit* ("gives orders in her will") : 116 *disponit* ("gives orders to servants"); 111 *odores* : 116 *odores*; 113 *destringit balsama* : 115 *destringit cinnama* (Lebek correctly remarks, "Spracharmut"), and others.

A certain sophistication and inventiveness, however, in poetic expression prevails. For example, the meaningful antithesis of 21 *maestusque beato* /, reflecting the old truth that wealth cannot buy happiness (compare the difference between εὐδαίμων and εὐτυχής at Euripides, *Alcestis* 1228-30, between ὀλβιος and εὐκλής at *Christus Patiens* 1016-18). Or the rhyme at the line-end: 60 *abisse* / : 61 *obisse* / : 62 *perisse* / : 63 *subisse*, and other alliterations: 56 *nate, late*: <ibi> *te*; 60 *tumulatus* : 61 *mutatus*; 63 *Cererem Veneremque*. Or the device of a hiatus in the main caesura: 22; 35; 56. Finally, notice the emphasis expressed in this piece of Senecan philosophy: *labuntur cedunt moriuntur contumulantur* (69).

In conclusion, the *Alcestis* from Barcelona is a valuable acquisition for late Latin poetry. Its versification is skillful, its expression is picturesque, eloquent and fascinating. Doubtless, the poet stands under the spell of Propertius' Cornelia (IV. 11) and Cynthia (IV. 7), and he has succeeded in conveying all the *ethos* of *Alcestis* and all the *pathos* of *Admetus*' plight. The main value of the poem, however, rests in its rich use of motifs drawn from folklore, spread throughout the poem (lines 5 f.; 17; 32-34; 47-50; 54 f.; 56; 59; 64; 85-88; 90; 96 f.; 99; 117 f.). These motifs deserve a closer look than was possible in a brief introduction to an edition.⁵

⁵ *Sigla*. Since the papyrus shows no physical damage, deletions by modern scholars are indicated by square brackets [] (instead of by braces), while angle brackets < > denote supplements by modern scholars. Double square brackets [[]], however, indicate deletions made by the scribe himself. The papyrus abounds in dots placed all around the letters (some of them indicate wrong letters, others again the end of a line, etc.). In the present apparatus, only the dots relevant to the reading and understanding of the poem are reported. Therefore the dots placed above or after a letter reflect supralinear or infralinear dots written by the scribe (or by an ancient reader), while the dots placed under a letter simply indicate that the letter is not clear enough (and the dots in the middle of a line denote completely illegible letters or blank *spatia*). Incidentally, our scribe sometimes writes a small *o* with a *lineola* beneath it (◌̣) and also a *b* or an *i* with a dieresis above the letter.—*Ed.* stands for the *editio princeps* by R. Roca-Puig; *Hutch.* for G. O. Hutchinson; *Leb.* for W. D. Lebek; *Marc.* for M. Marcovich; *Nisb.* for R. G. M. Nisbet, and *Pars.* for P. J. Parsons.—J. K. Newman and D. F. Bright have kindly polished my English, but for any blunder in Latin I am to blame alone: *numquam est satis provide homini*. Finally, *Ed.* offers a rich collection of poetic borrowings, not all of which are relevant.

⟨ALCESTIS⟩

“PR⟨A⟩ESCIE LAURIPOTENS, LATONIE DELI⟨E⟩ P⟨A⟩EAN:

INVOCO TE LAURUSQUE TUO DE NOMINE LECTAS.

⟨ARCITENENS⟩, DA SCIRE DIEM, DA NOSCERE, QUANDO

RUMPANT ADMETI FATALIA FILA SORORES.

QUAE FINIS VITAE, QUI⟨D⟩ MI POST FATA RELINQUANT,

5

EDOCE, SIDEREA⟨S⟩ ANIMUS CUM FU⟨G⟩IT IN AURAS.

QUAMVIS SCIRE HOMINI, NI PROSPERA VITA FUTURA ⟨EST⟩,

TORMENTUM (SIT⟨N⟩) ATRA DIES ET PALLIDA REGNA?),

EDE TAMEN, SI TE COLUI FAMULUMQUE PAVENTEM

1 *Lauripotens* : solus Mart. Capella 1. 24 || 3 *Arcitenens* (i.q. *Apollo*) : Naev. *Poet.* 30 (32). 1 (ap. Macrobian. *Sat.* 6. 5. 8); Hostianus *Poet.* 4 (6) *Apollo arcitenens Latonius*; Verg. *Aen.* 3. 75; Ov. *Met.* 1. 441; 6. 265; Sil. It. 5. 177; Stat. *Ach.* 1. 682; *Silvae* 4. 4. 95; Arnob. *Adv. nat.* 4. 22 *arcitenens Delius*; Coripp. *Iohannid.* 1. 458 / *Arcitenens*; Sidon. *Carm.* 1. 7; 23. 266 || 4 *fila Sorores* / : Sil. It. 3. 96; 17. 361; Stat. *Silvae* 1. 4. 123 || 5 *mi . . . fata relinquunt* / : Ov. *Met.* 14. 153 || 6 *animus cum fu⟨g⟩it in auras* / : Lucr. 3. 221 *spiritus . . . diffugit in auras*; 3. 400 (*anima*) . . . *discedit in auras*; 3. 436; Verg. *Aen.* 2. 791 *recessit in auras* (sc. *umbra Creusae*); 5. 740 = *Alceste* 33 *fugit ceu fumus in auras*; 11. 617 *vitam dispergit in auras*; Ov. *Heroid.* 10. 121; *Met.* 8. 524; 14. 432; Sil. It. 9. 167; 16. 545 *dirus in invitas effugit spiritus auras*; Verg. *Aen.* 3. 585 sq. *aethra / siderea* || 8 *pallida regna* : Sil. It. 11. 472; Verg. *Aen.* 8. 244 sq.; Lucan. 1. 456; Arator *Act. apost.* 1. 179 ||

inscript. *Alcestis* suppl. Marc. conl. Anth. Lat. I no. 15 *Alceste* || initium carminis deesse putat Hutch. || 1 *presciae . . . latoniaeae* P | *lauripotens* : *apollo* superscribit P, del. Leb., Hutch., Marc. | *Deli⟨e⟩ P⟨a⟩ean* Leb., Pars. (cf. v. 12) : *dolipiant* P || 2 *laurusque tuo* Leb., Pars., Marc. : *laurus* (sec. u ex corr.) *quemtuus* P | *nomine* P : *numine* Pars., agn. Leb. | *lectas* Marc. (cf. v. 70 *tegit* : *legit* P; v. 85 *legat* : *tegat* P) : *tectas* (t corr. ex c) P : *certas* Pars., agn. Leb. || 3 *Arcitenens* suppl. Marc. : *apollo* contra metrum P : — — Leb. : *imploro* Nisb. : *Phoebe, mihi* e.g. Hutch. | *scire* (s ex corr.) P || 5 *qui⟨d⟩* ed. : *qui* P : *quae* (sc. *vita*) Leb. (“das [mein Leben] mich nach meinem Tode verlässt”) | *relinqua[[nt]]m* (i.e., *nt* corr. in *m* ?) P : *relinquat* (sc. *vita*) Leb. || 6 *aedoce* P : *me doce* conl. Leb., J. K. Newman (per litteras) | *siderea⟨s⟩* Leb., Pars., Marc. : *siderea* P | *animus* ed. : *animus* P, retinet Leb. (“wenn es [das Leben] den Geist sich in die Sternenlücke auflösen lässt”) | *cum fu⟨g⟩it* (possis et *cum fu⟨lu⟨x⟩it*) Marc. : *quandoluit* P : *quum soluit* (sc. *vita*) Leb. : *quando exit* Pars. | *auras* P : *oras* Nisb. (conl. Boethii *Cons.* 4 *carm.* 6. 18) || 7 *quamvis scire* P : *quae nescire* Hutch. | *homini* Leb., Hutch., Nisb., Marc. : *hominis* P | *ni* Marc. : *sit* P, Leb. : *seu* Hutch., Nisb. | *futura ⟨est⟩* Nisb. : *futuri* P : *futura* Leb. || 8 *tortmentum (sit⟨n⟩)* Marc. : *tortmentumsit* P : *tortmentum sit, ⟨an⟩* Leb. : *tortmentum, siue* Hutch. Nisb. | *regna* Marc. (cf. v. 7 *vita* et vv. 13-14 *Acherontis . . . regna*; v. 61 *fratris Stygii regnum*) : *uitam* P : *vita* ed., agn. Leb., Pars. : *fata* Nisb. || 9 *aedelamen* P (ut vid.), corr. Leb., Pars. | *sinonte* P, corr. Leb., Pars. | *famolunquae* P, corr. ed. ||

SUCEPI PECUDUMQUE DUCEM POST CRIMINA DIVUM
ACCEPI IUSSI(QUE) IDEM DARE IUBILA SILVIS."

10

PR(A)ESCUS (H)EU P(A)EAN: "DOLEO, SED VERA FATEBO(R):
MORS VICINA PREMIT M(A)ESTIQUE AC(H)ERON(T)IS ADIRE
IAM PROPE REGNA TIBI GRATAMQUE RELINQUERE LUCEM.
SED VENIAT, PRO TE QUI MORTIS DAMNA SUBIRE
POSSIT ET INSTANTIS IN SE CONVERTERE CASUS,
TU POTERIS POSTHAC ALIENO VIVERE FATO.
IAM TIBI CUM GENITOR, GENETRIX CUM CAR(A) SUPERSIT
ET CONIUX NATIQUE RUDES, PETE, LUMINA PRO TE
QUI CLAUDAT FATOQUE TUO TUMULOQUE CREMETUR."

15

20

ILLE LAREM POST DICTA PETIT M(A)ESTUSQUE BEATO
IACTAT MEMBRA TORO ET FLETIBUS ATRIA CONPLET.

10 *post crimina divum* : cf. Stat. *Theb.* 6. 376 *sic Iovis imperia et nigrae voluere Sorores* (de Apollinis servitio); Lucian. *De sacrif.* 4 *καῖοστρακισθεῖς διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* . . . (sc. Apollo) || 11 *accepi iussi(que) idem* : cf. Hygini *Fab.* 51. 2 *Apollo autem, quod ab eo* (sc. Admeto) *in servitudinem liberaliter esset acceptus*, . . . || 12 *sed vera fatebo(r)* / : Stat. *Ach.* 1. 146; Ov. *Heroid.* 8. 97 || 13 *mors vicina premit* : Lucan. 7. 50 *mortis vicinae properantis admovet horas*; Alcesta 53 sq. (Apollo): / *Disce tuum* . . . / *advenisse diem*; *nam lux inimica propinquat* | *m(a)estique Ac(h)eron(t)is* : Sil. It. 14. 243; cf. Lucan. 6. 782; *Culex* 273 *maesta* . . . *Ditis* . . . *regna* || 16 (*qui*) *possit* : i.q. *qui fortitudinem animumque habeat*; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4. 418 sq. *hunc ego si potui tantum sperare dolorem, / et perferre, soror, potero*; Prop. 3. 12. 1 | *instantis* : cf. Alcesta 75 *fatoque urgenti incumbere* || 17 *alieno vivere fato* : cf. Ov. *Met.* 7. 168 *deme meis annis et demptos adde parenti*; Prop. 4. 11. 95 *quod mihi detractum est, vestros accedat ad annos*; Tibull. 1. 6. 63 sq. *proprius ego tecum, / sit modo fas, annos contribuuisse velim*; Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index* E165 || 18 : cf. Apollodor. *Bibl.* 1. 9. 15. 3 *ὥς δὲ ἦλθεν ἡ τοῦ θήσκειν ἡμέρα, μήτε τοῦ πατρὸς μήτε τῆς μητρὸς ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ* (sc. Ἀδμήτου) *θήσκειν θελόντων, Ἀλκυστις ὑπεραπέθανεν*; Hygin. *Fab.* 51. 3; Alcesta 66 *audiat haec genitor: patet atri ianua Ditis* || 21-22 *beato* . . . *toro* : Stat. *Silvae* 5. 1. 227 sq. || 22 *membra toro* : Verg. *Aen.* 6. 220; Sil. It. 6. 90; Stat. *Theb.* 2. 92; 2. 125 | *atria conplet* / : Ov. *Met.* 5. 153 ||

10 *sucepi* P : *suscepi* ed. | *pecudumque* P | *crimine* P, corr. ed. || 11 *iossi* (i corr. ex o) P, corr. ed. | *-que* add. Leb., Pars., Marc. | *post silvis* addit P f *apollo* in mg. dextra (i.e., notam personae loquentis) || 12 *prescius* P | *(h)eu* coni. Leb. : *eu* P : *en* Pars. : *hic* Leb., Hutch. (conl. v. 32) | *P(a)ean* Leb., Pars. (cf. v. 1) : *pian* P | *doleo* (o corr. ex u) P | *seo* . . . *fatebo* P, corr. ed. || 13 *post mors* addit inquit P, del. ed. | *vicinam* P | *m(a)estique* Hutch., Marc. : *m estumque* P : *m(a)estumque* Leb. | *aceronis* P, corr. ed. (p. 49) || 15 *subire* ed. : *subiret* P || 16 *possit* P : *poscat* olim Marc. | *casus* ed. : *casum* P || 17 *posthac* ed. : *posthaci* P (ut vid.) || 18 *qum* . . . *qum* P | *genitor* Leb., Pars., Marc. : *genitum* P | *car* P | *susupsit* P || 19 *-que* ed. : *quae* P || 20 *qui* ed. : *quae* P | *claudat* P : *linquat* Nisb. | *cremetur* P (cf. v. 48 *flammae*; v. 49 *ignis*; v. 116 *arsurosque*) : *prematur* Nisb. || 21 *m(a)estusque* Pars., Marc. : *mestumque* P, *m(a)estumque* Leb. (adverb.) | *beato* (b corr. ex u) P || 22 *toro et* : *hiatum* in caesura in vv. 35, 56 habes ||

AD NATUM GENITOR TRISTE(M) CONCURRIT ET ALTO
 PECTORE SUSPIRANS LACRIMIS (QUAE) CAUSA REQUIRIT.
 EDOCET ILLE PATREM FATORUM DAMNA SUORUM: 25
 "ME RAPIT, ECCE, DIES, GENITOR: PARA FUNERA NATO.
 HOC PARC(A)E DOCUERE NEFAS, HOC NOSTER APOLLO
 INVITUS, PATER, EDOCUIT. SE(D) REDDERE VITAM
 TU, GENITOR, TU, SANCTE, POTES, SI TEMPORA DONES,
 SI PRO ME MORTEM SUBITAM TUMULOSQUE SUBIRE 30
 DIGNE(R)IS NATOQUE TUA(M) CONCEDERE LUCEM."
 HIC GENITOR, NON UT GENITOR: "SI LUMINA POSCAS,
 CONCEDAM, GRATEQUE MANUM DE CORPORE NOSTRO,
 NATE, VELIS, TRIBUAM: VIVET MANUS ALTERA MECUM;
 SI SINE LUMINE (E)RO, ALIQUID TAMEN ESSE VIDEBOR: 35
 NIL ERO, SI QU(O)D SUM DONAVERO. QUANTA SENECT(A)E
 VITA MEAE SUPEREST, MINIMAM VI TOLLERE VI(S) IAM?
 QUAM PROPTER MEA REGNA DEDI TIBI, CASTRA RELIQUI.

23-24 *alto / pectore* : Verg. *Aen.* 6. 599 sq. | *alto pectore suspirans* : Ov. *Met.* 1. 655 sq.; cf. Sil. It. 9. 151 sq. *imo / pectore suspirans*; *Alcesta* 92 || 24 *lacrimis* : cf. Lucan 3. 607 *causam lacrimis* || 26 *dies* (sc. *mortis*) : *Alcesta* 53 sq. *disce tuum . . . / advenisse diem*; Verg. *Aen.* 10. 467; *Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 1522. 15 *Buecheler die sua peremptus*; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1. 9. 15. 3 | *funera nato* / : Ov. *Ibis* 583; Stat. *Theb.* 9. 365 || 27 *noster Apollo* / : Stat. *Theb.* 3. 628; Eur. *Bacchae* 1250 || 32-33 *si lumina poscas, / concedam, grateque manum* : cf. NT Mt. 5:29 sq. (J. K. Newman) || 33 *de corpore nostro* / : Iuv. 13. 92 || 36 *senect(a)e* : cf. *Alcestae* v. 73 *longaevio . . . parenti* (sc. *Admeti*) || 38 *castra reliqui* : i.q. *palatium meum tibi dedi*; cf. Iuv. 4. 135; *Hist. Aug. Hadrian.* 13 (Lebek); Claud. *In Honorii IV consul.* 10; Macrobian. *Sat.* 2. 4. 6; *CIL* VI. 8520; 33469; Lydi *De magistr.* 2. 30 | *castra reliqui* : Verg. *Aen.* 10. 604 ||

23 *triste(m)* Pars., Marc. : *triste* P, retinet Leb. (adverb.) || 24 *lacrimis (quae)* Nisb. : *lacrimarum* P, retinet Leb. | *causa* P : *causa(m)* Leb. | *requeret* P, corr. ed. || 25 *suorum* Leb. : *sorum* P, Oxon. || 26 *dies* Leb., Pars. : *uides* P | *genitur* (it ex corr.) P (cf. v. 29) | *para* (~) : cf. v. 6 *edoce* (~) | *nato*. P (finis versus) || 27 *Parc(a)e docuere nefas* Leb., Pars. : *parcedoquerenufas* P | *docuere* : *cecinere* Hutch., *dixere* Nisb. (at cf. v. 25 *edocet* : v. 28 *edocuit*; v. 113 *destringit* : v. 115 *destringit*) || 28 *se(d)* Leb., Pars. : *se* P | *reddere* ed. : *seddere* P (ut vid.) || 29 *admet(us)* addit P in mg. sinistra | *genitur* P (cf. v. 26) | *sanct(e)* P || 30 *tumulosque* Leb., Hutch., Nisb. : *tu'mulisque* P || 31 *digne(r)is natoque* ed. : *digneosnatosque* P | *tuam* Leb. : *tuo* P, retinent Oxon. | *lucem* (l ex corr.) P || 32 ante *si* addit *gens* P, del. Leb., Pars. | post *poscas* addit P f f *pat(er)* in mg. dextra || 33 *grateque* Hutch. : *gr atamque* P, Leb. || 34 *ue[[l]]is* P || 35 *lumine/r.o* P, corr. ed. || 36 *nihil* P, corr. ed. | *si quod sum* ed. : *sicutsuum* P | *senecte* P || 37 *vita meae* ed. : *uitameae* P : *extremae* Nisb. | *vi* Marc. : *uis* P | *vi(s) iam?* Marc. : *uitam* (i corr. ex s) P, retinent Oxon. : *v(i)s tu* Leb. || 38 *quam* ed. : *quem* P, retinet Leb. | *mea* Hutch. : *quea* P : del. ed. : *quia* Leb., Pars. | *regna* Leb., Pars. : *regnam* P : *regnum* ed. | *deds* P | *relin qui* P, corr. ed. ||

CONT(R)ISTANT TUMUL(I), (VI)TA QUIA DULCIUS UNA
NIL MIHI. POST MORTEM QUAM TU SI REDDERE POSSES,
(G)RATE CESSISSEM (NATO) TUMULOSQUE (H)ABITASSE(M),
VISURUS POST FATA DIEM."

40

PULSUS GENETRICIS

VOLVITUR ANTE PEDES, VESTIGIA BLANDUS ADORAT
INQUE SINUS FUNDIT LACRIMAS. FUGIT ILLA ROGANTEM,
NEC PIETATE, NOCENS, NEC VINCITUR INPROBA FLETU,
HAEC SUPER INPROPERANS: "OBLITA MENTE PARENTUM
TU, SCELERATE, POTES MATERNA(M) CERNERE MORTE(M),
TU TUMULIS GAUDERE MEIS? HAEC UBERA FLAMMAE
DIRIPIA(N)T, UTERUM(QUE) ROGI VIS ULTIMUS IGNIS
CONSUMAT, QUOD TE PEPERI(T), HOSTIS MIHI LUCIS,
HOSTIS, NATE, PATRIS? VITAM CONCEDERE VELLEM,
SI SEMPER POSSES TER(R)ENA SEDE MORARI.

45

50

43 *volvitur ante pedes* : Prop. 3. 8. 12 | *vestigia . . . adorat* / : cf. Stat. *Theb.* 12. 817
|| 45 : cf. *Alceste* 76 sq. *sed nullis ille* (sc. *Admeti pater*) *movetur* / *fletibus aut voces ullas tractabilis audit* || 46 *inproperans* : cf. Petron. 38. 11; VT *Itala*: Sap. 2:12; Ps. 73:10; *Pastoris Hermiae* vers. vulg. 2. 2 || 49 *ultimus ignis* : Sen. *Herc. Oet.* 1609; Quint. *Declam.* 6. 2 || 51 : cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11. 111 *et vivis concedere vellem* / || 52 *sede morari* / : cf. Ov. *Met.* 2. 846 || 53 *Cur metui(s) mortem, cui nascimur?* : cf., e.g., Sen. *Ad Marciam* 10. 5 *mors enim illi* (sc. *filio tuo*) *denuntiata nascenti est; in hanc legem erat satus, hoc illum fatum ab utero statim prosequabatur*; Eurip. *Alc.* 418 sq. *γίγνωσκε δὲ* (sc. *Ἄδμητῇ*) / *ὥς πᾶσιν ἡμῖν καθθανεῖν ὀφείλεται* ||

39 *cont(r)istant tumul(i)* Leb. : *contustanttumol* P : *combusta . . . (dulcior urna)* / Pars. | *(vi)ta quia* Marc. (cf. v. 37 *vitae* P) : *tae* (e ex corr.) *quam* (a ex corr.) P : *nec vita* Leb. | *dulcius una* Hutch. : *dulciorullam* P : *dulcior ulla* Leb. : *dulcior urna* Pars. || 40 *nil* ed. (cf. v. 36) : *nihil* P : *(res)* add. et *[nihil]* del. Leb. (i.e., *nec vita dulcior ulla / res mihi*) | *si* ed. : *fi* P : *sic* Pars. | *posses* Hutch. : *uellis* P : *velles* ed., agn. Leb., Pars. || 41 *(g)rate cessissem (nato)* Marc. (cf. v. 33 *grateque*; v. 73 *libens*) : *nateuoconcessissem* P : *nate, diu concessissem* Leb. : *nate, tibi cessisse velim* Hutch. (*cessisse velim* Nisb.) | *tumulosque* ed. : *edtumulusque* P | *(h)abitasse(m)* Leb., Marc. : *abitasse* P (*hab-* ed.) || 42 *diu(m)* P || *pulsusque* P, corr. ed. || 43 *darte* P | *blandus* Leb., Hutch., Nisb., Marc. : *"d"landus* (i.e., *sive vlandus sive adulandus*) P || 44 *inque* (u corr. ex n) P | *lacrimas* Leb., Hutch., Marc. : *lacrimum* P : *lacrimam* ed., Pars. | *fugit* P || 45 *pietatem* P, corr. Leb., Pars. | *fletus* P, corr. ed. || 46 *oblita* Hutch. : *oblitus* P, retinet Leb. || 47 *ante tu* *notam personae mater* addit P in mg. sinistra | *maternacerneremorte* P, corr. Leb., Pars., Marc. : *materna vivere morte* Nisb. || 48 *ubira flam.mae* (finis versus) P || 49 *diripia(n)t* Leb., Hutch. : *deripiat* P (-nt ed.) | *-que* add. Leb., Pars. | *rogi* Pars. : *cogis* P : *rogis* Leb. | *uis.* P || 50 *consumad* P | *quod te peperit(t)* Marc., Leb. : *quodtepeperi* P : *quo te peperit* Leb., Newman : *qui te peperit(t)* Pars. | *mihi lucis* Marc. : *meaelucis* P : *genetricis* Leb., Nisb. || 51 *natae* P || 52 *semper* P : *superum* Hutch. | *posses* Leb., Hutch. : *possis* P | *ter(r)ena* Marc. : *a.eternam* P, retinet Leb. ("wenn du immer dem Grabe fernbleiben könntest!"), *vix recte* : *aeterna* ed. : *corruptum* Pars. : *aeternum* Hutch. : *terrarum* Nisb. | *sede* P : *sede(m)* Leb. | *murari* P ||

CUR METUI(S) MORTEM, CUI NASCIMUR? EFFUGE LONGE,
 QUO PART(H)US, QUO MEDUS ARABS(QUE); UBI BARBARUS ALES
 NASCITUR, AC NOBIS ITERATUS FINGITUR ORBIS;
 ILLIC, NATE, LATE: (IBI) TE TUA FATA SEQUENTUR.
 PERPETUUM NIHIL EST, NIHIL EST SINE MORTE CREATUM:
 LUX RAPITUR ET NOX ORITUR, MORIUNTUR ET ANNI;
 NON EST TERRA LOCO, QUO (R)ES GENERAVERAT ANTE.

55

IPSE PATER MUNDI FERTUR TUMULATUS ABISSE
 ET FRATRI(S) STYGII REGNUM MUTATUS OBISSE;
 BACC(H)UM FAMA REFERT (T)ITA(NU)M EX ARTE PERISSE,
 PER(QUE) VADUM LETHE(S) CEREREM VENEREMQUE SUBISSE.

60

54 : cf., e.g., Catull. 11. 2-8 || 54-55 *ubi barbarus ales / nascitur, ac nobis iteratus fingitur orbis* : de avis phoenicis magno anno (annorum vertentium 1461 vel 1000 vel 500) agit poeta; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 10. 5 *cum huius alitis* (sc. *phoenicis*) *vita magni conversionem anni fieri*; 29. 29; Tac. *Ann.* 6. 28; Lact. *De ave phoen.* 59-64; Claud. *Carm. min.* 27. 104 sq. *te* (sc. *phoenice*) *saecula teste / cuncta revolvuntur*; Clem. *Rom. Ep. ad Cor.* 25 s.f.; Herodot. 2. 73 || 56 *fata sequentur* / : Sil. *It.* 8. 38; Prop. 2. 22. 19 || 60-63 *abisse / . . . obisse / . . . perisse / . . . subisse* / : cf., e.g., *Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 500. 4-7 Buecheler *meruisti / . . . timuisti / . . . tacuisti / . . . obisti* / ; Anth. *Lat.* 1. 1 No. 273. 5-11 Riese *ligemus / . . . metamus / . . . necemus / . . . perimamus / . . . crememus / . . . necemus / . . . volemus* / (Lebek); Verg. *Aen.* 4. 603-06 || 61 *fratri(s) Stygii* : Verg. *Aen.* 9. 104; 10. 113 || 62 *(T)ita(nu)m ex arte perisse* : cf. Clem. *Protrept.* 17. 2 *ὁδῶν δὲ ὑποδύντων Τιτάνων, ἀπατήσαντες παυδαριώδεσιν ἀθύρμασιν, οὗτοι δὲ οἱ Τιτᾶνες διέσπασαν* (sc. *Bacchum*) (Lebek); Arnob. *Adv. nat.* 5. 19 *ut occupatus puerilibus ludicris distractus ab Titanis Liber sit, ut ab isdem membratim sectus . . .* || 63 *vadum Lethe(s)* : Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 680 *placido quieta labitur Lethe vado* ||

53 *sur P* | *metui P*, corr. Leb., Pars., Marc. | *quicui P*, corr. Leb., Pars., Marc. | *effugaealongae P*, corr. Leb., Pars., Marc. || 54 *Part(h)us, quo Pars.* : *partusque P* : *Partus[que]* ed., Leb. | *Medus Arabs(que)* ed. : *medusarabs P* : *Medus(que et) Arabs Leb.* : *mollis Arabs Nisb.* || 55 *nascitur, ac nobis iteratus fingitur orbis Marc.* (*nobis fingitur = homines fingunt*) : *nascitur adque nobis iteratum cingitur* (c corr. ex u, ut vid.) *urbis P* : *nascitur adque novos iteratum fingitur ortus Leb.* ("wo der barbarische Phönixvogel geboren wird und wiederum zu neuer Geburt gebildet wird") : *nascitur atque novis iteratus †cingitur urbis† Pars.* : *stinguitur atque novis iteratus nascitur orsis Hutch., Nisb.* : . . . *fingitur orbis ed.* : *conditur aris coni. Pars.* (conl. Claud. *Carm. min.* 27. 94) || 56 *late: (ibi) te Marc.* (cf. hiatum in vv. 22; 35) : *latete P* : *late, (sed) te Hutch., agn. Leb.* : *late, (at) te Pars.* || 59 *loco, quo (r)es generaverat Marc.* (*loco = statu, gradu*) : *locus* (cf. v. 2) *quo se generab'erat P* : *loco* (Pars.) *quo se generaverat* (*secreverat Nisb.*) Oxon. (non intellego) : *non est terra locos, quos egeneraverat ante?* Leb. ("Verschlingt nicht die Erde die Orte, die sie zuvor hervorgebracht hatte?"), conl. Plin. *Hist. nat.* 2. 205 *ipsa se comest terra, vix recte* || 60 *ante ipse addit P poe(ta) in mg. sinistra* || 61 *fratre P*, corr. ed. | *Stygii Hutch., Nisb.* (confer test.) : *stygium P*, retinet Leb. | *mutatus Hutch., Marc.* : *multatus P*, retinet Leb. || 62 *baccum P, Leb.* | *(T)ita(nu)m ex arte Marc.* (*de et ex confundere videtur P*: vv. 95; 103) : *itamdearte P* : *Titanum marte Pars.* : *(T)itanide (ab) arte Leb.* (qui etiam *(sub)ita de (m)orte* temptabat) || 63 *per(que) vadum Leb., Pars.* : *pervadam P* : *per vada* ed. | *Lethe(s) Hutch.* : *lechi P* : *lethi Leb.* : *leti Pars.* ||

CUR EGO DE NATO DOLEAM, QUEM FATA REPOSCUNT?	
CUR EGO NON PLANGAM, SICUT PLANXERE PRIORES?	65
AMISIT NATUM DIOMEDE, CARPSIT AGAE;	
PERDIDIT ALT(HA)EA (G)NATUM, DEA PERDIDIT INO;	
FLEVIT ITYN PROGNE, DUM COLLIGIT ILIA CRUDA.	68
NAM QU(A)ECUMQUE TEGIT (CA)ELI V(I)S VEL VAGUS AER	70
LABUNTUR CEDUNT MORIUNTUR CONTUMULANTUR."	69
CONIUGIS UT TALIS VIDIT PELIEIA FLETUS,	
"ME, (ME) TRADE NECI, ME, CONIUX, TRADE SEPULCRIS,"	
EXCLAMAT. "CONCEDO LIBENS, EGO TEMPORA DONO,	
ADMETE, (AD)VENTURA TIBI, PRO CONIUGE CONIUX.	
SI VINCO MATREM, VINCO PIETATE PARENTEM,	75
SI M(OR)IOR, LAUS MAGNA MEI POST FUNERA NOSTRA.	

64 *fata reposcunt* / : Prop. 2. 1. 71; Ov. Met. 13. 180; cf. Alcestae v. 82 sq. *stat sua cuique dies . . . / utere sorte tua: patet atri ianua Ditis* || **68** *flevit Ityn Progne* : Hor. Carm. 4. 12. 5 sq.; Mart. 10. 51. 4; Ov. Amor. 3. 12. 32 = Heroid. 15. 154 || **70** (ca)eli v(i)s : Ov. Met. 1. 26 *igneae convexi vis et sine pondere caeli* | *vagus aer* : Tibull. 3. 7. 21; (Catull. 65. 17) || **72** *trade neci* : Verg. Georg. 4. 90; Ov. Fast. 4. 840 *dede neci* || **73** *libens* : cf. Hygini Fab. 51. 3 . . . *ut pro se (sc. Admeto) alius voluntarie moreretur. Pro quo cum neque pater neque mater mori voluisset, uxor se Alcestis obtulit et pro eo vicaria morte interiit*; Apollod. Bibl. 1. 9. 15. 2 *ἀν ἐκουσίως τις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θηήσκειν ἔληται* || **74** *pro coniuge coniux* / : Ov. Met. 7. 589; Heroid. 3. 37 || **76** *laus magna mei* : cf. Alcestae v. 154 *aeternam moriens famam tam certa tulisti (sc. Alcestis)* | *funera nostra* : Prop. 2. 1. 56 ||

64 *reposcunt* Leb., Nisb. : *deposcunt* P || **66** *admisit* P, corr. ed. | *Diomede* Pars. (scil. mater Hyacinthi Hutch.) : *diomedes* P : *Clymene* Leb. | *carpsit* P : *discerpsit* Leb. | *Agae* Leb., Pars. : *acatem* P || **67** *perdidit bis* P | *Alt(ha)ea* ed. : *alpea* P : *Althaeae* Hutch. | (g)natum Marc. : *natum* P | *Ino* Leb., Nisb. : *ion* P || **68** *flevit* corr. ex *eleliit* P (ut vid.) | *Ityn* Leb., Pars., Marc. : *etin* P | *Progne* Leb., Pars. (*Procne*), Marc. : *prigne* P | *dum* Marc. : *et* P : *quem* Hutch. | *colligit* P : *concinit* Leb. | *ilia cruda* Marc. : *illa cruentus* P : *illa cruentum* Leb. : *ipsa cruentum* Pars. || **70**, **69** : *huic illum versum praeposuit* Pars. || **70** *quecumque* P | *tegit* (ca)eli v(i)s Leb. (confl. Ovid. Met. 1. 26) : *legitillius* P : *gerit* Hutch. et *tellus* Pars. et (mare) add. Hutch., Nisb. || **69** *cedunt* Leb., Pars., Marc. : *precedunt* P : *pereunt* Nisb. | *contumulantur* P (finis versus) || **71** *Pelieia* Hutch. : *peleide* P : *Pelia edita* Leb. || **72** *ante me* notam personae x *alcestis* addit P in mg. sinistra | *me* (me) Hutch., Pars. (confl. Verg. Aen. 9. 427) : *me* P | *post me* addit *inquit* P, del. Hutch., Pars., agn. Leb., Marc. : *inquit* ed. | *neci* Leb., Marc. : *niquid* P : *inquit* ed., agn. Oxon. | *sepulcris* P || **73** *exclamat* Leb. (confl. v. 123) : *exclamans* P, retinet Oxon. | *libiens* P || **74** (ad)ventura Marc. (cf. Admete) : *ventura* P, retinet Leb. : (e)ventura Nisb. || **75** *si* P : *si* (c) Leb., Nisb. | *parentem* Hutch., Nisb., Marc. : *parentis* P, retinet Leb. ("die Eltern") || **76** *m(or)ior* Leb., Hutch., Marc. : *meor* P : *m(or)iar* ed. | *mei* P : *mihi* Nisb. | *funera nostra* ed. : *funeremostro* P : *funera restat* Nisbet, agn. Oxon. ||

NON ERO, SED FACTUM TOTIS NARRABITUR ANNIS,
ET CONIUX PIA SEMPER ERO. NON TRISTIOR ATROS
ASPICIAM VULTUS, NEC TOTO TEMPORE FLEBO,
DUM CINERES SERVABO TUOS. LACRIMOSA RECEDAT 80
VITA PROCUL: MORS ISTA PLACET. ME TRADE SEPULCRIS,
ME PORTET MELIUS NIGRO VELAMINE PO<R>T<H>MEUS.

HOC TANTUM MORITURA ROGO, NE POST MEA FATA
DULCIOR ULLA TIBI, VESTIGIA NE MEA CONIUX
CARIOR ISTA LEGAT. ET TU, NE<C> NOMINE TANTUM, 85
ME COLE, MEQUE PUTA TECUM SUB NOCTE IACERE.

IN GREMIO CINERES NOSTROS DIGNARE TENERE,
NEC TIMIDA TRACTARE MANU, SUDARE FA<V>IL<L>AS
UNGUENTO, TITULUMQUE NOVO PR<A>ECINGERE FLORE.

77 : cf. Ov. Met. 14. 435 || 78-79 *atros* . . . *vultus* : cf. Hor. Epist. 1. 19. 12 || 82 *nigro velamine* : cf. Ov. Met. 11. 611 | Po<R>t<H>meus : i.q. *portitor* Charon: Petron. 121 v. 117; Iuv. 3. 266; Carm. Lat. Epigr. 1549. 3 || 83 *moritura rogo* : Eurip. Alc. 300 αἰτήσομαι γάρ σ'; 308 αἰτοῦμαι σ' ἐγώ; Alceste 124 *adiuro* (sc. te) et *repetens iterumque iterumque monebo* || 84-85 (ne) *dulcior ulla tibi* . . . *ne* . . . *coniux / carior* : cf. Eurip. Alc. 305 καὶ μὴ 'πιγῆμης τοῖσδε μητρὶνὰ τέκνους . . . ; Alceste vv. 125 sq. *castum servare cubile / sis memor*; 127 sq. *lectumque iugalem / natis parce tuis* | *coniux* . . . *carior* : cf. Ov. Trist. 5. 14. 2 || 86 *meque puta tecum sub nocte iacere* : cf. Prop. 4. 11. 81-84:

sat tibi sint noctes, quas de me, Paulle, fatiges,
somniaque in faciem credita saepe meam:
atque ubi secreto nostra ad simulcra loqueris,
ut responsurae singula verba iace.

Hygini Fab. 104. 1 *itaque fecit* (sc. Laodamia) *simulacrum aereum simile Protesilai coniugis et in thalamis posuit sub simulatione sacrorum, et eum colere coepit. Quod cum famulus . . . per rimam aspexit viditque eam ab amplexu Protesilai simulacrum tenentem atque osculantem* . . . ; Apollodori Epitome 3. 30 καὶ ποιήσασα (sc. Λαοδάμεια) εἰδῶλον Πρωτεσίλαφ παραπλήσιον τούτῳ προσωμίλει; Eustath. ad Iliad. 2. 701 (p. 325. 25 = 1, p. 507. 3 van der Valk) εὔρεν (sc. Πρωτεσίλαος) ἐκέειν (sc. Λαοδάμειαν) ἀγάλαμι αὐτοῦ περικειμένην; 325. 30 = 507. 8 ἀλλὰ κατεχομένη ἐνυκτέρευε μετὰ τοῦ ἀνδρός, μᾶλλον αἰρουμένη τὴν πρὸς τὸν τεθνεῶτα, φασί, συνουσίαν ἢ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ζῶντας ὁμίλιαν || 88 *tractare manu* : Stat. Silvae 5. 1. 88 ||

78 *tristior atos* ed. : *trustioratus* P : *tristis* Nisb. et *amatos* Hutch. || 79 *uultus* P : *cultus* Nisb. | *nec* Marc. : *non* P | *flebo* P (finis versus) || 80 *dum* Marc. : *aut* P | *recedat* Leb., Hutch., Nisb. : *recedam* P || 81 *procum* P | *traderepulcris* P, corr. ed. || 82 po<R>t<H>meus Pars., Leb. (po<R>tmeus) : potneus P || 84 *ulla* P | *tibi* P : *adeat* Hutch. | *uestigiam* P | *mea, coniux, interpungit* Leb. ("Gatte!") || 85 *legat* Leb., Marc. : *legat* P, retinent Oxon. | *ne<C>* Nisb. : *me* P || 87 *cineres* Leb. : *cineris* P, retinent Oxon. (at cf. v. 80 *cineres*) | *dignare tenere* Leb., Pars. : *neuedignaretinere* (i.e., *neve digna retinere*) P || 88 *tractare* P | *sudare fa<v>il<L>as unguento* Leb., Marc. : *sudarefailasunguentum* P : *stillare* (Hutch.) *favillis* (ed.) *unguentum* Oxon. || 89 *titolumque* P | *precingere* P ||

SI REDEUNT UMBR(A)E, VENIAM TECUM(QUE) IACEBO.	90
QUALISCUMQUE TAMEN, CONIUX, NE DESERA(R) A TE, NEC DOLEAM DE ME, QUOD VITAM DESERO PRO TE.	
ANTE OMNES COMMENDO TIBI PIA PIGNORA NATOS, PIGNORA, QUAE SOLO DE TE FECUNDA CREAVI, EX TE SIC NULLAS HABE(A)T MORS ISTA QUERELLAS.	95
NON PEREO, NEC ENIM MORIOR: ME, CREDE, RESERVO, QUAE MIHI TAM SIMILES NATOS MORITURA RELINQUO.	
QUOS, ROGO, NE PARVOS MAN(U)S INDIGNA(ND)A NOVERCAE PRODAT, ET (H)EU FLENTES MATRIS PIA VINDICET UMBRA.	
SI ME DISSIMULES, SI NON MEA DULCIS IMAGO PAULUM AD TE VENI(AT) . . .	100

90 *si redeunt umbr(a)e, veniam tecum(que) iacebo* : cf. Prop. 4. 7. 3 sq. *Cynthia namque meo visa est incumbere fulcro* / . . . *nuper humata*; 89 *nocte vagae ferimur, nox clausas liberat umbras* || 93 *ante omnes* : Verg. Aen. 6. 667 | *commendo tibi pia pignora natos* : Prop. 4. 11. 73 *Nunc tibi commendo communia pignora natos* || 94 *solo de te* : cf. Prop. 4. 11. 36 *in lapide hoc uni nupta fuisse legar* || 98-99 *quos . . . ne parvos man(u)s indigna(nda) novercae* / *prodat* : cf. Eurip. Alc. 305-10

. . . καὶ μὴ 'πιγῆμης τοῖσδε μητρικῶν τέκνοις,

ἥτις κακίων οὐσ' ἐμοῦ γυνῆ φθόνῳ

τοῖς σοῖσι καμῶις παισὶ χεῖρα προσβαλεῖ . . .

Prop. 4. 11. 85-90; Alceste 127 sq. || 99 *matris pia vindicet umbra* : Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index* E221. 2. 1; E323.2; cf. Prop. 4. 11. 74 *haec cura* (sc. *natorum*) *et cineri spirat inusta meo* || 100 *si me dissimules* : cf. Ov. Ex Ponto 1. 2. 146 *non potes hanc* (sc. *coniugem meam*) *salva dissimulare fide* | *dulcis imago* / : Stat. Silvae 1. 2. 112; Theb. 5. 608; (Verg. Aen. 6. 695) || 101 *post* (si non) . . . *paulum ad te veni(at)* *exspectes talia verba*: *Sequitur atris ignibus absens* (sc. *Dido Aeneas*) / *et, cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus, / omnibus umbra locis adero. Dabis, improbe, poenas.* Verg. Aen. 4. 384-86; cf. 520 sq. ||

90 [[de]]redeunt P | umbre P | ueniam tecum sub nocte iacebo P : veniam tecum(que) [sub nocte, cf. v. 86] iacebo Hutch., Marc. : [veniam] tecum sub nocte iacebo ed., agn. Leb. || 91 -quae P | tamen. P | desera(r) ed. : desere P || versus 92 ante 91 transponit Hutch., tum 92 *ne doleas de me* Pars., Nisb. || 92 quid P | desero Leb., Nisb. : degero P || 93 omnes Nisb., Marc. : omnem P | commen.do P || 94 te (t additum) P || 95 ex Marc. : de P, omnes (de te: sic interpungunt Oxon. : de te sic Leb., "So möge von dir aus dieser Tod keinerlei Klagen in sich bergen!") | habe(a)t Leb., Pars., Marc. : habet P | quaerellam P || 96 pereor P | moreor P | me crede reseruo P : mi crede, reservo(r) ed., agn. Oxon. || 97 mihi Nisb. : tibi P || 98 mans P, corr. ed. | indigna(nda) R. Kassel (per litteras) : indigna P || 99 prodat, et (h)eu Marc. : proderentet P : proderet, et ed., agn. Leb. : verberet et Nisb. (qui etiam terreat et temptabat) || 100 si me dissimules, si Marc. : si tibi dissimiles hoc P, ret. Leb. ("Wenn du dir dies vernachlässigen solltest, dann kommt nicht mein süßes Bild ein wenig in der Nacht") : si tibi dissimiles, si Hutch. | dulcis. / simago P || 101 paulum P rursus Nisb. | ad te Marc. : nate P (ut vid.) : no(c)te ed., agn. omnes | veni(at) Marc. : ueni P : veni(t) Leb., Pars. (sine lacuna) | post veni(at) lacunam, uxoris oblitae vindictam continentem, statuit Marc. ||

. . . ET TU PRO CONIUGE CARA

DISCE MORI, DE M(E) DISCE EXEMPLU(M) PIETATIS.”

IAM VAGA SIDERIBUS NOX PINGEBATUR ET ALES
RORE SOPORIFERO CONPLEVE(RA)T OMNIA SOMNUS:
AD MORTEM PROPERANS, IN CONIUGE FIXA IACEBAT
ALCESTIS LACRIMASQ(UE) VIRI PERITURA VIDEBAT.
PLANGERE SAEPE IUBET SESE NATOSQUE VIRUMQUE,
DISPONIT FAMULOS, CONPONIT IN ORDINE FUNUS
L(A)ETA SIBI: PICTOSQUE TOROS VARIOSQUE PA(RATUS) . . .

105

110

†. . . ONES†

BARBARICAS FRONDES (ET) ODORES, TURA CROCUMQUE.
PALLIDA SUDANTI DESTRINGIT BALSAMA VIRGA,

103 : cf. Sil. It. 5. 638-40 / *disce ex me pugnās, vel (si pugnare negatum) / disce mori: dabit exemplum non vile futuris / Flaminius* || **104-05** : cf. Verg. Aen. 4. 522 *Nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem / corpora per terras . . . 529 at non infelix animi Phoenissa*; 3. 147 *Nox erat et terris animalia somnus habebat*; 2. 8 sq. | *ales* / . . . *Somnus* : Stat. Theb. 10. 302 *deus aliger* (sc. *Somnus*) || **107** : cf. Ov. Heroid. 10. 119 *nec lacrimas matris moritura videbo* || **109** *disponit* : de testatorum voluntate, cf. TLL V. 1427. 20 sq.; e.g., Vulg. 2 Reg. 17:23 *disposita domo sua . . . interiit* || **110** *pictosque toros* : Ov. Heroid. 12. 30; Verg. Aen. 1. 708; 4. 206 sq. | *pa(ratus)* : cf. Ov. Fast. 3. 627 *Tyrios induta paratus* / || **112** *frondes* : cf. Verg. Aen. 4. 506 sq. || *odores, tura crocumque* : cf. Verg. Georg. 1. 56 sq. *Nonne vides, croceos ut Tmolus odores, / India mittit ebur, molles sua tura Sabaei . . . ?* || **113** *sudanti . . . balsama virga* : Verg. Georg. 2. 118 sq. *Quid tibi odorato referam sudantia ligno / balsama . . . ?*; Iustini Hist. 36. 3. 4 *arbores opobalsami certo anni tempore balsamum sudant*; Tac. Germ. 45. 7 *ubi* (sc. in Oriente) *tura balsamaque sudantur*; Prudent. Cathemer. 5. 117 *illic et gracili balsama surculo desudata fluunt*; Hieron. Epist. 107. 1-2 *ut . . . viles virgulae balsama pretiosa sudarent* (Lebek) ||

102 *cara* Nisb., Marc. : *caro* P, retinet Leb. (sc. “*et tu, lector*”) || **103** *de m(e) disce exemplum* Nisb. : *disce ex m exempla* P : <tu> *disce exempla ex m(e)* Hutch. || **104** *ante iam addit P poet(a)* in mg. sinistra | *ales* Pars. : *alis* P || **105** *sopordfero* P | *conpleve(r)a*t . . . *Somnus* Pars. : *conplebent . . . somnum* P || **106** *mortem*. P | *prope.rans* P | *coniuge* P | *iacebat* P || **107** *alcestem*. P, corr. ed. | *-q(ue) viri* Leb., Hutch., Nisb. : *quiri* P || **108** *plangere* P || **109** *famulos* (u corr. ex o) P || **110** *l(a)eta* Leb., Pars. : *leta* P | *pictusque* P, corr. ed. | post *variosque* lacunam statuit Hutch. : post *pa(ratus)* Marc. | *pa(ratus)* / . . . †ones† Marc. : *paones* P : *paratus* (sine lacuna) Leb. : <ta>petas / Nisb. et . . . <re>ponens / Pars. || **112** *barbaricas* (corr. ex *uaruar-*) P : *Arabicas* Nisb. (at cf. v. 54) | <et> *odores* Leb., Hutch., Nisb., Marc. : *oduresque* P | *crucumque* P || **113** *pallida* Pars., Marc. : *pa.llada* P : *Pallada* Leb. (“Öl streift sie vom balsamtriefenden Zweig”) | *dstringit* Leb. : *dstringit* (d corr. ex u) P : corruptum Oxon. : *destillat* Nisb. | *palsama* P ||

EREPTUM NIDO PR(A)ECIDIT PULVER AMOMI,
ARIDA PURPUREIS DESTRINGIT CINNAMA RAMIS,
ARSUROSQUE OMNES SECUM DISPONIT ODORES.

115

⟨H⟩ORA PROPINQUABAT LUCEM RA(P)TURA PUELLAE,
TRACTAVITQUE MANU: RIGOR OMNIA CORRIPIEBAT.
C(A)ERULEOS UNGUES OCULIS MORITURA NOTABAT
ALGENTISQUE PEDES, FATALI FRIGORE PRESSOS.
ADMETI IN GREMIU(M) REFUGIT FUGIENTIS IMAGO.
UT VIDIT SENSUS ⟨LABI⟩, "DULCISIME CONIUX,"
EXCLAMAT, "RAPIOR: VENIT, MORS ULTIMA VENIT,
INFERNUSQUE DEUS CLAUDIT ⟨MEA⟩ MEMBRA SOPORE."

120

114 *nido* . . . *pulver amomi* : Plin. *N.H.* 12. 85 *Cinnamomum et casias fabulose narravit antiquitas princepsque Herodotus* [3. 111] *avium nidis* . . . *ex inviis rupibus arboribusque decuti* . . . (Oxon.) | *pulver* (neutro genere) : *Carm. Lat. Epigr.* 2222 = *CIL* VIII. 7277 *haec via tale pulver habet*; Anon. *med. ed.* Piechotta 119; *Hippiatr. Gr.* I, p. 390. 21; 419. 5 O.-H. (Lebek) || **117** *Hora* (sc. *mortis*) : cf. *TLL* VI. 2963. 30-57 || **118** *rigor omnia corripiebat* : cf. Sil. It. 4. 456 *corripuit pallor*; *Alcesta* 133 = Verg. *Aen.* 4. 499 *Haec effata silet, pallor simul occupat ora*; 161 sq. *Cui talia fanti / dilapsus color atque in ventos vita recessit* || **121** *fugientis imago* / : Verg. *Aen.* 10. 656 *Aeneae fugientis imago* / ; Sil. It. 17. 644 *Hannibalis campis fugientis imago* / || **122** *Dulcissime coniux* : *Alcesta* 87 *o pulcherrime coniux* / ; 118 = 125 / *O dulcis coniux* || **123** : cf. *Alcestae* v. 161 "*Tempus,*" ait (sc. *Alcestis*), "*deus, ecce deus!*" || **124** *membra sopore* / : *Lucr.* 3. 453; Sil. It. 3. 170; Verg. *Aen.* 8. 406

114 *nido* P, retinet Oxon. conl. Plin. *Hist. nat.* 12. 85 | *precidit* P | *pulver* P (neutro genere), retinet Leb. : †*pulver*† Oxon. : *culmen* Nisb. || **115** *pur'p.ureis* P | *destringit* Leb., Hutch. : *distingit* P (cf. v. 113) || **116** *arsurusque* P | *desponit* P || **117** *ora* P, corr. ed. | *ratura* P || **118** *tractavitque manu* (sc. *Hora mortis*) Marc. (cf. v. 88) : *tractabatque manos* P : *tractabatque manus* ed. : *corruptum* Oxon. : *attractansque vel frigeabantque manus* Nisb. | *omnia* (sc. *membra*) P : *extima* Nisb. | *corripiebat* Nisb. : *diripiebat* P, retinet Leb. : *praeripiebat* Hutch. || **119** *ceruleos* P | *oculos* P, corr. ed. | *moritura* P (cf. vv. 83; 97; 107) : *moribunda* Nisb. || **120** *algentisque* P | *pressos* Hutch., Marc. : *pressum* P : *prensos* Nisb. : *pressa* Pars. : *pressam* Leb. ("Aus ihr, die von Todeskälte im Schoss Admets bedrängt wurde, flieht das Bild der Fliehenden") || **121** *admeti* P (cf. vv. 4; 74) : *coniugis* Hutch. | *gremium* Hutch. : *gremio* P, retinet Leb. | *post imago addit* P ff— *alcestis* in mg. *dextra* || **122** *uidit* P : *cedit* coni. Hutch. | *sensus* : in P *litterae nus* *lineola transfixae* | *labi* add. Hutch. | *ante dulcissime* addit P *coniux ex* (x ex corr.) : *ut dissographiam* del. ed. et Hutch. || **123** *rapeor* P | *moris* P || **124** *inferiusque* P | *claudit* Leb., Hutch., Nisb., Marc. : *claudet* P : *condit* coni. Hutch., Nisb., Pars. | ⟨*mea*⟩ suppl. ed. : *vacat spatium trium litt.* in P : *mihi* suppl. Hutch. | *sembra soporem* P, corr. ed. || *finem carminis deesse* credit Hutch.

Translation

ALCESTIS

"O, Delian Paean, son of Latona! O prescient Lord of laurels! I invoke you along with the laurels select because of your name. O, Bow-bearer, grant me to know the day of my death; grant me to learn when the Fates will break the life-thread of Admetus! Tell me, what will be the end of my life, and what Destiny may have in store for me once my spirit has gone into the starry sphere. I know, unless a man's life after death is a blessed one, it is anguish for him to know this (is it going to be a life without light, a realm of shadows?). Nevertheless, tell me, if I worshiped you ever; if I ever offered you support when you came to me as a terrified servant after the gods' charge against you; if I ever accepted you to be my herdsman, and sent you to the forests to raise shouts of joy!"

(12) Alas! Such was the answer of the prescient Paean: "I grieve for you, but I must tell the truth. Death is pressing upon you: the time is close for you to abandon the dear light of day and approach the gloomy realm of Acheron. However, should somebody come forward having the heart to suffer death for you, to take on himself your impending misfortune, you will be granted henceforth to live the destiny of somebody else. Why, your father, your dear mother are still alive; and so are your wife and your young sons: go and ask them who may be willing to shut his eyes forever for you, to be burnt on the pyre as a substitute for your fate and grave."

(21) Having learnt this, Admetus withdraws to his home. Stricken with grief he cannot help tossing his limbs on the rich couch, and his weeping reaches every corner of the palace. The father hurries to his sorrowful son, and sighing from the depth of his breast asks him the reason for these tears. The son tells his father about his decreed death: "Father, my day of death is carrying me away: prepare a funeral for your son! This awful mishap was revealed by the Fates, it was reluctantly revealed by our Apollo. But you, father, you, venerable one, can restore my life, if you only would donate the rest of your days to me; if you would deign to grant your own life to your son, to suffer sudden death and approach the tomb for me."

(32) Hear now the father speaking unlike a father! "Should you ask me for my eyes, I would grant them to you. Should you want a hand from my body, my son, I would gladly give it to you. Still I would be left with the other hand, and though deprived of sight, I would still have the appearance of a living being. But if I grant you my very being, there will be nothing left of me. Little life is left to

my old age: are you after even this little, to snatch it away before its time? Why, it was to enjoy this brief life that I have given my kingdom to you, that I have left my court to you. Of the grave I dare not think: there is nothing sweeter to my heart than life alone. I would gladly yield to my son's wish and go to the grave for him, if only you had the power of restoring my life after death, enabling me to see the daylight again!"

(42) Rejected by his father, Admetus throws himself before the feet of his mother, embraces them in reverence and adulation, and sheds tears in her lap. But she, in her wickedness, shuns the suppliant. She, the heartless one, would be won neither by imploration nor by the sense of maternal duty. Worse still, she starts casting reproaches: "Are you out of your mind, you criminal wretch? How can you forget your duty toward your parents? How can you watch the death of your own mother and enjoy seeing her tomb? Is that what you want—that the flames of the pyre devour these breasts, that the final funeral pile take away the very womb which gave you birth? You, son, a foe to my lifelight, a foe to your own father! Still, I would gladly give my life for you if only I were sure you could remain on earth forever!

(53) "Why are you afraid of death for which we all are born? Escape to the end of the world—there where the Parthian or Mede or Arab lives; there where the strange bird phoenix is born, so that mankind may imagine the birth of a new world-era. Go, son, and hide there: and there your fate will reach you! Nothing lasts forever, nothing is born free from death. Daylight wanes, and night takes its place; the seasons die, and even the (aging) Earth is no longer the same as she was when creating all things.

(60) "The Father of the universe himself, they say, was buried and gone: he changed his shape and went down to visit the infernal realm of his brother. Bacchus perished—so the story goes—through the guile of the Titans, and both Ceres and Venus crossed the stream of Lethe.

(64) "Why should I grieve for a son who is claimed by Destiny? Why should I be exempt from mourning when other mothers mourned in the past? Why, Diomedes lost her son, and Agave tore hers asunder. Althaea killed her son, and so did the goddess Ino. Procne too bewailed Itys while collecting his bleeding entrails. For, whatever lives under the heavenly vault and the roaming wind perishes, passes away, dies, and is buried for good."

(71) When the daughter of Pelias saw these tears of her husband, she cried aloud: "I, I want to be sent to death! My husband, I want

to go to the grave for you! I grant you gladly, I donate my coming days to you, Admetus, a spouse for her spouse! If I die for you, if my sense of duty proves to be greater than that of your mother, than that of your father, immense glory will be in store for me after my death. True, I shall be no more, but my feat will be remembered through centuries to come, and I shall live forever as a *pious wife*. And besides, I shall not look at the sullen faces around me for the rest of my life, I shall not weep each time I attend to your ashes. May such a life of tears stay away from me! I prefer this death. Let me be sent to the grave, let me be carried away by the Ferryman attired in black!

(83) "Before I die, I have only one wish for you. After I am gone, may you never love another woman as much as you did me, may the wife to take my place never be dearer to your heart than I was! As for you, keep loving me! I mean it, not in name only! Think that you are sleeping with me during the night! Do not hesitate to take my ashes into your lap, caress them with a firm hand! Take care that the glowing ashes sweat with oil, and gird my tomb with fresh flowers. If it is true that shades return, I shall come to lie down with you. Whatever shape I may have then, my husband, abandon me not! Let me not be sorry for leaving this daylight for you!

(93) "And before anything else, I entrust you with the pledge of our love, our sons; the pledge which I have borne being pregnant by you alone, so that you may have no complaint about this departure of mine. I shall not perish, I shall not die: believe me, I am preserving myself by leaving behind me the children resembling their mother so much. They are still small: I beg you, may no unworthy hand of a stepmother betray them! Alas! Know that the faithful shade of the mother will come to avenge her crying children!

(100) "And if you neglect me, if the sweet image of me does not come to your mind from time to time . . . * . . . and you too learn to die for your (new) wife (if need be), learn from my example what a sense of duty is."

(104) Stars had already begun to adorn the moving night, and the winged god of Sleep had already dropped the slumber-bringing dew in everybody's eyes, when Alcestis, hastening to die, was lying awake gazing at her husband, watching him shed tears at her imminent death. Now, she bids both her husband and sons often to mourn loudly for her; she takes care of her servants in her last will; she arranges for her own funeral, glad in her heart. Here is her ornate bier, here her embroidered last garment . . . * (she piles up) foreign plants, spices and perfumes, frankincense and saffron-essence. She

collects the pale balsam from the wet balsam-tree; she beats to powder the fragrant amomum, snatched away from a bird's nest; she gathers the dry cinnamon from the purple-colored boughs, and she gives orders for all these spices to be burnt on the pyre along with her.

(117) The Hour of death was approaching the young woman to take away her daylight. She touched her with her hand, no more. Numbness started seizing her every limb. Dying slowly, she watched her fingernails becoming blue, her freezing feet growing heavy with the frost of death. A fleeting shadow, woman no more, she seeks refuge in Admetus' lap. And when she felt that her senses were leaving her for good, she cries aloud: "Husband, my love! Death, death at the last has come: she is taking me away. The infernal god is enfolding my limbs with slumber."

University of Illinois at Urbana—Champaign

CORRIGENDA

The following list of *errata* has been supplied by Professor M. Sicherl to his article in *ICS* VII (1982), "Die Vorlagen des Kopisten Valeriano Albini":

- p. 328 line 5 for: **Pluteus XIX** read: **Pluteus XVII**
- p. 332 In the stemma, **Albini 1532** should be attached to **Neap. II A 13** (but not to **Bonon. 2304**).
- p. 337 In the stemma, **(Maleas)** should be deleted.
- p. 340 lines 32-33 for: **letzterer nachweislich** read: **letzterer (ff. 348-Ende) nachweislich**
- p. 345 line 15 for: **98-** read: **93-**
- p. 346 line 7 for: **den Text des Appian** read: **Appians Annibaika und Iberika**
- p. 346 line 17 for: **vermuten** read: **vermuten, aber dieser enthält die fraglichen Bücher nicht**
- p. 356 line 43 for: **29** read: **58**

The Lost Histories of Alexander

Lionel Pearson

A reprint of an important work originally published in 1960. Professor Pearson here writes a new chapter in the history of Greek literature, investigating the peculiarities of the different historians of Alexander, especially those who accompanied him on his expedition or might have done so. Consideration is also given to the features they have in common and the contributions they appear to have made to the later literary and historical tradition of Alexander.

Code: 40 00 20

Paper \$21.00 (14.00)*

Lionel Pearson: Selected Papers

Donald Lateiner and Susan Stephens, editors

Professor Pearson's articles presented in this volume were selected to suggest the scope and depth of his interests in Greek prose literature and Greek history. The selection concentrates on the Greek geographers, historians, and orators and their sources, methods, purposes, and historical context. A generous sampling of Professor Pearson's book reviews on these same subjects complements the articles. Indexes, updated references, and Professor Pearson's complete bibliography are included.

Code: 00 16 04

Cloth \$14.95 (9.95)

Seneca: Selected Moral Epistles

Anna Lydia Motto

Seneca: Selected Moral Epistles is designed primarily as a rapid reader for Latin courses. It includes the Latin text with notes and facing vocabulary and a complete vocabulary at the end of the book. The epistles selected present a wide variety of reflections relevant to humanistic concerns.

Code: 40 03 08

Paper \$12.00 (10.25)

Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*

J. T. Ramsey

This book comprises an introduction, Latin text of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, running commentary, and indices. The introduction discusses the life and writings of Sallust, his importance as a prose stylist, and his contribution to Roman historiography.

Code: 40 03 09

Paper \$14.00 (12.00)

*() denotes member price. Prepayment required. M/C & Visa accepted. CA residents add 6% sales tax. Postage/handling: first item \$1.00, \$.50 for each thereafter; \$4.00 maximum. Outside US \$2.00 surcharge.

SCHOLARS PRESS

CUSTOMER SERVICES

P.O. Box 4869, Hampden Station, Baltimore, MD 21211



MICROFICHE

Classical Studies on Microfiche

<i>Thesaurus Graecae Linguae</i>	\$172.50
<i>Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Roemischen Mythologie</i>	\$130.50
<i>Dictionaire des Antiquites Grecques et Romaines d'apres les Textes et les Monuments</i>	\$139.50
<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>	\$219.00
<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>	\$435.00
Compilations and Collections of Classical Authors	\$450.00
Greek and Latin Epigraphy	\$375.00
<i>L'Année Philologique</i>	\$514.50
<i>A Concordance to the Greek Satyr Play</i> by Dana Ferrin Sutton	\$ 7.00
<i>Arrian Concordance</i> by J. D. Bolter and P. A. Stadter	\$ 17.50

SP Classic Works in Archaeology

Syro-Palestinian Surveys—Unit A	\$156.00
Syro-Palestinian Site Reports—Unit A	\$ 61.50

American Society of Papyrologists

Papyrology on Microfiche I	\$462.00
Papyrology on Microfiche II	\$462.00
Papyrology on Microfiche I & II	\$924.00

All microfiche orders must be prepaid. Please add 1% for postage and handling, \$1.50 minimum; outside U.S. add additional \$2.00 surcharge. Proforma invoice will be issued on request.

MICROFICHE READERS in a variety of models manufactured by Northwest Microfilm, Inc. are available through Scholars Press ranging in price from \$220.00 to \$360.00. Write to Scholars Press Microfiche Department for more information.

SCHOLARS PRESS

Microfiche Dept.

P.O. Box 2268, 101 Salem St., Chico, CA 95927





ILLINOIS CLASSICAL STUDIES